arXiv:1702.01837v1 [math.AP] 7 Feb 2017

ABOUT SMALL EIGENVALUES OF WITTEN LAPLACIAN

LAURENT MICHEL

Abstract. We study the eigenvalues of the semiclassical Witten Laplacian Δ_ϕ associated to a potential ϕ. We consider the case where the sequence of Arrhenius numbers $S_1 \leq \ldots \leq S_n$ associated to ϕ is degenerated, that is the preceding inequality are not necessarily strict.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Labelling of minima 3
1.2. Main result 6
1.3. General strategy of the proof 10
2. Construction of adapted quasimodes 12
2.1. Gathering minima by equivalence class 12
2.2. Quasimodes for 0-forms 14
2.3. Quasimodes for 1-forms 22
2.4. Projection onto the eigenspaces 22
3. Preliminary for singular values analysis 23
4. Computation of singular values for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$ 29
4.1. Singular values of $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ in type II case 29
4.2. Singular values of $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ in type I case 30
5. Computation of singular values for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$ 32
5.1. Case of type II points 32
5.2. Case of type I points 38
5.3. Last arguments of the proof 39
5.4. Towards the general case 42
6. Some examples 44
6.1. Computations in dimension one under assumption H(1,2) 44
6.2. Computations in dimension one under assumption H(2,2) 45
6.3. Computations in higher dimension 46
Appendix A. Some results in linear algebra 48
Appendix B. On the equivalence class of $\mathcal{R}$ 51
B.1. An upper bound 51
B.2. Link between $\mathcal{R}$ and the Generic Assumption 54
Appendix C. List of symbols 55
References 55

1. Introduction

Let X be either $\mathbb{R}^d$ or a compact manifold of dimension d without boundary and let $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth Morse function. Consider the semiclassical Witten Laplacian associated to ϕ:

$$\Delta_\phi = -h^2\Delta + |\nabla\phi|^2 - h\Delta\phi \tag{1.1}$$

where $h \in]0,1]$ denotes the semiclassical parameter.

If X is a compact manifold, the operator Δ_ϕ is selfadjoint with domain $H^2(X)$ and its resolvent is compact. In the case $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ we make the additional assumption that there exists $C > 0$ and a compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K$, one has

$$|\nabla\phi(x)| \geq \frac{1}{C},\ |\operatorname{Hess}(\phi(x))| \leq C|\nabla\phi|^2,\ \text{and } \phi(x) \geq C|x|. \tag{1.2}$$

Then, Δ_ϕ is essentially selfadjoint on $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and thanks to (1.2), there exists $h_0 > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $h \in]0, h_0]$, we have

$$\sigma_{ess}(\Delta_\phi) \subset [c_0, \infty[.$$

In both situations X compact or $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, it is well-known that Δ_ϕ is non-negative. Hence $\sigma(\Delta_\phi) \subset [0, \infty[$ and it follows from the above remarks that $\sigma(\Delta_\phi) \cap [0, c_0[$ is made of non-negative eigenvalues. Moreover $e^{-\phi/h}$ is clearly in the kernel of Δ_ϕ and belongs to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ thanks to (1.2), so that the lowest eigenvalue of Δ_ϕ is clearly 0.

Since ϕ is a Morse function (and thanks to assumption (1.2) in the case $X = \mathbb{R}^d$), the set $\mathcal{U}$ of critical points is finite. In the following, for $p = 0, \ldots, d$, we will denote by $\mathcal{U}^{(p)}$ the set of critical points of ϕ of index p. Hence, $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is the set of minima and $\mathcal{U}^{(1)}$ the set of saddle points of ϕ. Throughout the paper, we will denote $n_j = \sharp\mathcal{U}^{(j)}$.

From the pioneer work by Witten [12], it is well-known that for small h, there is a correspondance between the small eigenvalues of Δ_ϕ and the critical points of ϕ. More precisely, by standard localization arguments one can show that there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for $h > 0$ small enough, Δ_ϕ has exactly n_0 eigenvalues in the interval $[0, \epsilon_0 h]$ that we denote $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_{n_0}$. This result is well-known if one replaces $\epsilon_0 h$ by $h^{3/2}$ (see [3] for a proof). To get the result with $\epsilon_0 h$, it suffices to work as in the proof of Lemma 4.10 and 4.11 of [1]. Moreover, these eigenvalues are actually exponentially small, that is live in an interval $[0, e^{-C/h}]$ for some $C > 0$ (see [4] for a proof). For topological concerns, these informations (together with the equivalent estimates for the Witten Laplacian $\Delta_\phi^{(p)}$ acting on p-forms) are sufficient to establish a correspondance between the small eigenvalues of $\Delta_\phi^{(p)}$ and the critical points of ϕ of index p. This permit for instance to give an analytical proof of Morse inequalities.

However, the operator Δ_ϕ appears also in the study of molecular dynamics driven by Langevin equation for mass-less particles

$$dx(t) = -2\nabla\phi(x)dt + dB_h(t) \tag{1.3}$$

on $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $h > 0$ denotes the temperature of the system and $B_h(t)$ is the Brownian motion with covariance matrix $\langle B_h(t), B_h(t')\rangle = \frac{h}{2}\delta(t - t')$. The associated density $\rho(t, x)$

of particles in position x at time t, is then solution of the Kramers-Schmoluchowski equation

$$\partial_t \rho - h^2 \Delta \rho + 2h \operatorname{div}(\rho \nabla \phi) = 0.$$

Writing $\rho = e^{-\phi/h}\tilde{\rho}$, one has $\partial \tilde{\rho} + \Delta_\phi \tilde{\rho} = 0$. Hence the behavior of $\tilde{\rho}$ when $t \to \infty$ is driven by the small eigenvalues of Δ_ϕ. For instance the inverses of the small eigenvalues yield the lifetime of any metastable state. Getting an asymptotic of these eigenvalues when $h \to 0$ is then of crucial interest.

Even if this problem has been studied for a long time, such a description was performed only recently. The first result was obtained in [2] by probabilistic approach and next improved in [5] using semiclassical methods. Later on, this spectral approach was successfully used in the study of Witten Laplacian on bounded domains (see [6] and [10]). However, in all these papers, the author make an assumption on the relative position of minima and saddle points that insures in fine that the small eigenvalues are all of different size. Even if this assumption is generic, some interesting cases remain open (for instance the symmetric double well case doesn't satisfy the assumption of [5]). In this paper, we establish the full asymptotic of the low eigenvalues in a more general situation allowing several wells of same height.

Before going further, let us introduce few notations that we use in this paper. For $x_0 \in X$ and $r > 0$, introduce the geodesic ball $B(x_0, r) = \{x \in X,\, d(x, x_0) < r\}$.

Throughout, we will say that $\mathbf{s}$ is a saddle point if it is a critical point of index 1.

Given $a(h), b(h) > 0$, two functions of the semiclassical parameter, we say that $a(h) \asymp b(h)$ if there exists some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $h > 0$ small one has $c_1 b(h) \leq a(h) \leq c_2 b(h)$. We say that a family of vectors $(a(h))_{h \in]0,1]}$ in a normed vector space V, admits a classical expansion if there exists a sequence of vectors (a_k) such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|a(h) - \sum_{n=0}^{N} h^n a_n\|_V \leq C_N h^{N+1}$$

for some constants C_N. We denote $a(h) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h^n a_n$.

As we shall see later, we will have to analyze carefully some finite dimensional matrices which are strongly linked to the critical points of ϕ. Given any subsets $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ of $\mathcal{U}$, it will be convenient to introduce the finite dimensional vector space $\mathscr{F}(\mathcal{B}_j)$ of real valued functions on $\mathcal{B}_j$. We shall then denote by $\mathscr{M}(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ the vector space of linear operators from $\mathscr{F}(\mathcal{B}_1)$ into $\mathscr{F}(\mathcal{B}_2)$.

1.1. **Labelling of minima.** Let us now recall the general labelling of minima introduced in [5] and generalized in [8]. The main ingredient is the notion of separating saddle point which is defined as follows. Given a saddle point $\mathbf{s}$ of ϕ, and $r > 0$ small enough, the set

$$\{x \in B(\mathbf{s}, r),\ \phi(x) < \phi(\mathbf{s})\}$$

has exactly two connected components $C_j(\mathbf{s}, r)$, $j = 1, 2$. The following definition is taken from [8], Definition 4.1.



FIGURE 1.1. Labelling procedure

Definition 1.1. *We say that* $\mathbf{s} \in X$ *is a separating saddle point (ssp) if it is a saddle point and if* $C_1(\mathbf{s}, r)$ *and* $C_2(\mathbf{s}, r)$ *are contained in two different connected components of* $\{x \in X,\, \phi(x) < \phi(\mathbf{s})\}$. *We will denote by* $\mathcal{V}^{(1)}$ *the set of ssp.*

We say that $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ *is a separating saddle value (ssv) if it is of the form* $\sigma = \phi(\mathbf{s})$ *with* $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. *We denote* $\underline{\Sigma} = \phi(\mathcal{V}^{(1)})$ *the set of ssv.*

We say that $E \subset X$ *is a critical component if there exists* $\sigma \in \underline{\Sigma}$ *such that* E *is a connected component of* $\{\phi < \sigma\}$ *and if* $E \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \neq \varnothing$. *We denote by* $\mathscr{C}$ *the set of critical components.*

Let us now describe the labelling procedure of [8]. Since ϕ is a Morse function, it has finitely many critical points and so $\underline{\Sigma}$ is finite. We denote $\sigma_2 > \sigma_3 > \ldots > \sigma_N$ its elements and for convenience we also introduce a fictive infinite saddle value $\sigma_1 = +\infty$ and denote $\Sigma = \underline{\Sigma} \cup \{\sigma_1\}$. Starting from σ_1, we will recursively associate to each σ_i a finite family of local minima $(\mathbf{m}_{i,j})_j$ and a finite family of critical components $(E_{i,j})_j$ (see Figure 1.1).

- Let $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_1) = \{x,\, \phi(x) < \sigma_1 = \infty\} = X$. We let $\mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ be any global minimum of ϕ (not necessarily unique) and $E_{1,1} = X$.
- Next we consider $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_2) = \{x \in X,\, \phi(x) < \sigma_2\}$. This is the union of its finitely many connected components. Exactly one of these components contains $\mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ and the other components are denoted by $E_{2,1}, \ldots, E_{2,N_2}$. In each component $E_{2,j}$, we pick up a point $\mathbf{m}_{2,j}$ which is a global minimum of $\phi_{|E_{2,j}}$.
- Suppose now that the families $(\mathbf{m}_{k,j})_j$ and $(E_{k,j})_j$ have been constructed until rank $k = i - 1$. The set $\mathcal{L}(\sigma_i) = \{x \in X, \phi(x) < \sigma_i\}$ has again finitely many connected components and we label $E_{i,j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, N_i$ those of these components that do not contain any $\mathbf{m}_{k,l}$ with $k < i$. In each $E_{i,j}$ we pick up a point $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ which is a global minimum of $\phi_{|E_{i,j}}$. Observe that for all $i \geq 2$, the components $E_{i,j}$ are all critical.

We run the procedure until all the minima have been labelled.

Remark 1.2. *The above labelling satisfies the following property. For any* $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$ *and any connected component* A_i *of* $\{\phi < \sigma_i\}$, *there exists a unique* (k, l) *such that* $k \leq i$ *and* $\mathbf{m}_{k,l} \in A_i$.

Proof. Let us start with the existence part of the result. If A_i is one of the $E_{i,j}$ for some j, then take $k = i$ and $l = j$. Otherwise, this means that in the labelling procedure, A_i already contained a minimum $\mathbf{m}_{k,l}$ with $k < i$.

Let us prove the uniqueness part. Assume that $\mathbf{m}_{k,l}, \mathbf{m}_{k',l'} \in A_i$ with $k \leq k' \leq i$. Then $A_i \cap E_{k',l'} \neq \varnothing$ and since A_i is a connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma_i\}$ with $\sigma_i \leq \sigma_{k'}$ it follows that $A_i \subset E_{k',l'}$. Since $\mathbf{m}_{k,l} \in A_i$, it follows that $\mathbf{m}_{k,l} \in E_{k',l'}$ which is impossible unless $(k,l) = (k',l')$. □

Using the above labelling, Hérau-Hitrik-Sjöstrand made some significative progress in [8] (in the more general situation of Kramers-Fokker-Planck operators, but this applies to Witten Laplacian). First, they showed in Theorem 7.1 that the exponentially small eigenvalues $(\lambda_{\mathbf{m}}(h))_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{U}^{(0)}}$ of Δ_ϕ (indexed by the sequence of local minima) satisfy $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}}(h) \asymp he^{-2S(\mathbf{m})/h}$ for some sequence of Arrhenius numbers $(S(\mathbf{m}))_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{U}^{(0)}}$. However, their method doesn't permit to prove that $h^{-1}\lambda_{\mathbf{m}}(h)e^{2S(\mathbf{m})/h}$ admits a limit when $h \to 0$. In order to compute the asymptotic expansion of the eigenvalues $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}}(h)$, they need to make some additional assumption on the interaction between minima and saddle points (see Assumption 5.1 in [8]). This hypothesis, which is a generalization of the one made in [5], can be formulated as follows with the notations of the preceding section:

Generic Assumption: For all $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $j = 1, \ldots, N_i$, the following hold true:

i) $\mathbf{m}_{i,j}$ is the unique global minimum of the application $\phi_{|E_{i,j}}$.
ii) if $E_{i,j} \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \neq \varnothing$, there exists a unique $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$ such that $\phi(\mathbf{s}) = \sup E_{i,j} \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. In particular, $]-\infty, \phi(\mathbf{s})[\cap E_{i,j}$ is the union of exactly two different connected components.

Under this assumption, the authors exhibit a specific bijection between $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cup \{\mathbf{s}_1\}$ where $\mathbf{s}_1$ is a fictive saddle point associated to $\sigma_1 = \infty$ and for which by convention $\phi(\mathbf{s}_1) = \infty$. Using this one to one correspondence, they exhibit some labelling $\mathcal{U}^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{n_0}\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{s}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_{n_0}\}$ such that the small eigenvalues $\lambda_i(h)$ are of the form $ha_i(h)e^{-2S_i/h}$ with $S_i = \phi(\mathbf{s}_i) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_i)$. Moreover, they prove that the a_i have a classical expansion and compute the leading term of this expansion (see Theorem 5.10 in [8]).

Let us observe that the Generic Assumption (GA) allows some degeneracy in the sequence (S_j), that is there may exists j such that $S_j = S_{j+1}$. However, (GA) remains restrictive for the following reasons:

- It permits only potential ϕ for which $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cup \{\mathbf{s}_1\}$ have the same cardinal.
- Because of ii), the height S_2 giving the spectral gap is necessarily non degenerate.
- The eventual degenerate heights are associated to weakly interacting eigenstate in the following sense. Assume for instance that $S_j = S_{j+1}$ for some $j = 1, \ldots, n_0 - 1$ and modify slightly the function ϕ near the minimum $\mathbf{m}_j$. Then the coefficients a_j is modified whereas the classical expansion of a_{j+1} remains unchanged.

In the present paper, we obtain a similar asymptotic expansion for the $\lambda_i(h)$ under lighter assumptions for which the typical heights may have more degeneracy. In particular our assumption doesn't have the above limitations.

1.2. **Main result.** In order to state our main result, we introduce few notations that will be used throughout the paper. First, using the above labelling, we define $\boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \to \Sigma$ by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}_{i,j}) = \sigma_i$ and $S = \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \to]0, +\infty]$ by $S(\mathbf{m}) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}) - \phi(\mathbf{m})$. We let $\mathcal{S} = S(\mathcal{U}^{(0)})$, then with the notations of the preceding section, we have

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\sigma_i - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{i,j}), i = 1, \dots, N,\ j = 1, \dots, N_i\}.$$

This is a finite set and we denote by $S_1 = +\infty > S_2 > S_3 > \dots > S_K$ its elements. For any $k = 1, \dots, K$, we also define the multiplicity of S_k, by

$$\mu_k := \sharp\{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)},\ S(\mathbf{m}) = S_k\} = \sharp\{(i,j),\ \sigma_i - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{i,j}) = S_k\}. \tag{1.4}$$

In all the paper, we denote by $\underline{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ the (non necessarily unique) absolute minimum of ϕ that was chosen at the first step of the labelling procedure, and we let

$$\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \setminus \{\underline{\mathbf{m}}\}. \tag{1.5}$$

Using again the above labelling, we can associate a critical component to any local minimum. More precisely, we define

$$E : \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \to \mathscr{C} \tag{1.6}$$

by $E(\mathbf{m}_{i,j}) = E_{i,j}$. Observe that by definition, this application is injective. Using this map, we can associate to each minimum $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ a boundary set given by $\Gamma(\mathbf{m}) = \partial E(\mathbf{m})$. Thanks to the fact that ϕ is a smooth Morse function, for any $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$, $\Gamma(\mathbf{m})$ is a smooth sub-manifold of X of dimension $d-1$. For our construction of quasimodes, we also need to introduce the set

$$H(\mathbf{m}) := \{\mathbf{m}' \in E(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{U}^{(0)},\ \phi(\mathbf{m}') = \phi(\mathbf{m})\}. \tag{1.7}$$

Given $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$, one has $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma_i$ for some $i \geq 2$, and it follows from the labelling procedure that there exists a unique connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma_{i-1}\}$ that contains $\mathbf{m}$ (observe that this component is not necessarily critical). We denote that component by $E_-(\mathbf{m})$, and by

$$E_- : \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} \to \Omega(X) \tag{1.8}$$

the corresponding application, where $\Omega(X)$ is the collection of connected open subsets of X. Thanks to Remark 1.2, we know that for any $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$, there exist a unique connected component of $\{x \in E_-(\mathbf{m}), \phi(x) < \sigma(\mathbf{m})\}$ whose intersection with $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{m}} := \{\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}') > \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m})\}$ is non empty. We denote this connected component by $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$. One can see easily that $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$ is always a critical component. Moreover, thanks again to Remark 1.2, $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{m}}$ is in fact reduced to one point that we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})$. Throughout, we denote by

$$\widehat{E} : \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} \to \mathscr{C} \tag{1.9}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}} : \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} \to \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \tag{1.10}$$

the corresponding applications. Observe that by definition, we have

$$\forall \mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)},\ \phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})) \leq \phi(\mathbf{m}). \tag{1.11}$$

The fact that the above inequality is large or strict plays an important role in our analysis.

Definition 1.3. *Let $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$. We say that $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I if $\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})) < \phi(\mathbf{m})$. If $\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})) = \phi(\mathbf{m})$, we say that $\mathbf{m}$ is of type II. We will denote*

$$\mathcal{U}^{(0),I} = \{\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)},\ \mathbf{m} \text{ is of type } I\}$$

$$\mathcal{U}^{(0),II} = \{\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)},\ \mathbf{m} \text{ is of type } II\}$$

We have clearly the following disjoint union $\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}^{(0),I} \cup \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}$.

Example 1.4. *Let us compute the preceding object in the case of potential ϕ represented in Figure 1.1. The results are presented in Figure 1.2.*

- *Let us start with the object associated to σ_2. By definition, $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}) = \widetilde{E}_2$, where $\widetilde{E}_2$ is the connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma_2\}$ that contains $\mathbf{m}_{1,1}$. Then we have $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}), \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}) = \mathbf{m}_{1,1}$.*

  Since $\phi(\mathbf{m}_{1,1}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})$, then $\mathbf{m}_{2,1}$ is of type II, whereas $\mathbf{m}_{2,2}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{2,3}$ are of type I.

- *Consider now the level σ_3. One has $E_-(\mathbf{m}_{3,1}) = E_-(\mathbf{m}_{3,2}) = \widetilde{E}_2$ and $E_-(\mathbf{m}_{3,3}) = E_-(\mathbf{m}_{3,4}) = E_{2,3}$. Therefore, $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{3,1}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{3,2}) = \widetilde{E}_3$ where $\widetilde{E}_3$ is the connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma_3\}$ that contains $m_{1,1}$. Similarly, one has $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{3,3}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{3,4}) = \widetilde{E}'_3$ where $\widetilde{E}'_3$ is the connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma_3\}$ that contains $m_{2,3}$. From this computations, it follows that $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{3,1}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{3,2}) = \mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ and since $\phi(\mathbf{m}_{1,1}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}_{3,1}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}_{3,2})$ it follows that $\mathbf{m}_{3,1}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{3,2}$ are both of type I. On the other hand, $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{3,3}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{3,4}) = \mathbf{m}_{2,3}$ and since $\phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,3}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}_{3,3}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}_{3,4})$ it follows that $\mathbf{m}_{3,3}$ is of type II and $\mathbf{m}_{3,4}$ of type I.*

- *Finally, $E_-(\mathbf{m}_{4,1}) = \widetilde{E}_3$, $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{4,1}) = \widetilde{E}_4$ as represented on Figure 1.2 and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{4,1}) = \mathbf{m}_{1,1}$. Since $\phi(\mathbf{m}_{1,1}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}_{4,1})$, it follows that $\mathbf{m}_{4,1}$ is of type II.*

The points of type II play an important role in our analysis. Given $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let $\Omega_\sigma = \Omega^0_\sigma \cup \widehat{\Omega}_\sigma$ with

$$\Omega^0_\sigma = \{E(\mathbf{m}), \mathbf{m} \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1}(\sigma)\} \tag{1.12}$$

and $\widehat{\Omega}_\sigma$ defined by $\widehat{\Omega}_\sigma = \varnothing$ if $\sigma = \sigma_1$ and

$$\widehat{\Omega}_\sigma = \{\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}),\ \mathbf{m} \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1}(\sigma) \cap \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}\} \tag{1.13}$$

if $\sigma \in \underline{\Sigma}$.

Definition 1.5. *We define an equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ on $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ by $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'$ if and only if*

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}') = \sigma \\ \exists \omega_1, \dots \omega_K \in \Omega_\sigma \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{m} \in \omega_1, \mathbf{m}' \in \omega_K \text{ and } \forall k = 1, \dots K-1,\ \overline{\omega_k} \cap \overline{\omega_{k+1}} \neq \varnothing \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$



FIGURE 1.2. Computations of Example 1.4

Throughout the paper, we denote by $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})$ the equivalence class of $\mathbf{m}$ for the relation $\mathcal{R}$. Observe that since $\underline{\mathbf{m}}$ is the only minimum such that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$, then $\mathrm{Cl}(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) = \{\underline{\mathbf{m}}\}$. As a direct consequence of the definition, one has the following simple but fundamental fact

$$\forall \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)},\ \big(\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}' \Longrightarrow E_-(\mathbf{m}) = E_-(\mathbf{m}')\big) \tag{1.15}$$

Let us now introduce our main assumption. Let $n, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ be fixed.

Hypothesis H(k,n). *We say that assumption H(k,n) is satisfied if for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ such that $S(\mathbf{m}) \geq S_n$, the function ϕ takes at most k different values on the equivalence class $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})$.*

It is clear that for all k we have $H(k,n) \Longrightarrow H(k+1,n)$. It is also clear that the assumption $H(N,N)$ is empty.

The assumption H(2,n) is more general than the generic assumption made in [8]. For instance, there exists potential satisfying H(2,n) for which one has not $\sharp\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} = \sharp\mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. In fact, it is proved in appendix that the Generic Assumption (GA) implies that each equivalence class of $\mathcal{R}$ contains exactly one minimum (which trivially implies H(1,N)). Figures 1.3, 1.4 below present some examples of potentials (in dimension 1) satisfying H(2,n) and not (GA). These examples as well as an example in higher dimension are discussed in detail in section 6.

Recall that in [8], Theorem 7.1, the authors proved (without any assumption on the minima) that for all $n = 2, \dots, N$, there are exactly μ_n eigenvalues $\lambda(h)$ of Δ_ϕ such that $\lambda(h) \asymp he^{-2S_n/h}$, the other eigenvalues lying in $[\epsilon_0 h, \infty[$. Throughout the paper we will denote by $\lambda_{n,\mu}(h)$, $\mu = 1, \dots \mu_n$, the eigenvalues of Δ_ϕ such that $\lambda_{n,\mu}(h) \asymp he^{-2S_n/h}$. In the



FIGURE 1.3. A potential satisfying H(1,2)

theorem below we sum up in a rather vague way the description of these eigenvalues that we obtained under assumption H(2,n) in section 4 and 5.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ be fixed and assume that $H(2,n)$ is satisfied. For all $k = 1, \dots, n$ and all $\mu = 1, \dots, \mu_k$, one has*

$$\lambda_{k,\mu}(h) = h b_{k,\mu}(h) e^{-2S_k/h}$$

where $b_{k,\mu} \sim \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} h^r b_{k,\mu,r}$ has a classical expansion and the $b_{k,\mu,0}$ are the μ_k non zero eigenvalues of an explicit matrix given by Theorems 4.1, 4.2, 5.1 and 5.2.

Let us now discuss assumptions H(k,n) on explicit examples. Let us fix $n = 2$ and consider the potentials ϕ given respectively by Figures 1.3, 1.4. In both cases $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}) = \mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ that we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ for short. Since $\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,j})$ for all j, then there is no point of type II, $\mathcal{U}^{(0),II} = \varnothing$ and hence $\Omega_{\sigma_2} = \{E_{2,1}, E_{2,2}, E_{2,3}\}$. Therefore, one can compute easily the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{R}$ in both cases:

- in the case of Figure 1.3, we have 3 equivalence classes: $c_1 = \{\mathbf{m}_{1,1}\}$, $c_2 = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,1}, \mathbf{m}_{2,2}\}$ and $c_3 = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,3}\}$. The potential ϕ is constant on each equivalence class, and hence H(1,2) is verified.
- in the case of Figure 1.4, we have 2 equivalence classes: $c_1 = \{\mathbf{m}_{1,1}\}$, $c_2 = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,1}, \mathbf{m}_{2,2}, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}\}$. The potential ϕ takes two different values on c_2 and hence H(2,2) is verified but not H(1,2).

We will come back to these examples at the end of the paper and compute explicitly the spectrum of Δ_ϕ in both cases.

Let us finish this discussion by an example where $\mathcal{U}^{(0),II} \neq \varnothing$. Consider the potential given by Figure 1.5. In that case $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}) = \mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ that we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ for short. Since $\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,2}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})$, then $\mathbf{m}_{2,1}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{2,2}$ are of type II and $\mathbf{m}_{2,3}$ is of type I. We still have $\Omega^0_{\sigma_2} = \{E_{2,1}, E_{2,2}, E_{2,3}\}$ but contrary to the previous case since $\widehat{\Omega}_{\sigma_2} = \{\widetilde{E}_2\}$ is non empty. It follows that $\Omega_{\sigma_2} = \{E_{2,1}, E_{2,2}, E_{2,3}, \widetilde{E}_2\}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ admits two equivalence classes: $c_1 = \{\mathbf{m}_{1,1}\}$, $c_2 = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,1}, \mathbf{m}_{2,2}, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}\}$. The potential ϕ takes two different values on c_2 and hence H(2,2) is verified but not H(1,2).



FIGURE 1.4. A potential satisfying H(2,2)



FIGURE 1.5. An example with points of type II

1.3. **General strategy of the proof.** Let us recall the general strategy followed in [5]. The starting point is to use the supersymmetric structure of the Witten Laplacian. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, let $\Omega^k(X) = \mathcal{C}^\infty(X, \Lambda^k T^*X)$ be the space of k-differential forms and denote $d : \Omega^k(X) \to \Omega^{k+1}(X)$ the exterior derivative and let $d^* : \Omega^k(X) \to \Omega^{k-1}(X)$ denote its adjoint for the natural paring.

The Witten complex associated to the function ϕ is defined by the semiclassical weighted de Rham differentiation

$$d_{\phi,h} = e^{-\phi/h} \circ hd \circ e^{\phi/h} = hd + d\phi^\wedge$$

and its adjoint

$$d^*_{\phi,h} = e^{\phi/h} \circ hd^* \circ e^{-\phi/h} = hd^* + d\phi^\lrcorner.$$

Then the semiclassical Witten Laplacian is defined on the forms of any degree by

$$\Delta_\phi = d^*_{\phi,h} \circ d_{\phi,h} + d_{\phi,h} \circ d^*_{\phi,h} \tag{1.16}$$

When restricted to the space of p-forms we denote this operator by $\Delta^{(p)}_\phi$ (observe that in the case $p = 0$, the above formula yields easily to (1.1)). Then, we have the following intertwining relation

$$d_{\phi,h}\Delta^{(p)}_\phi = \Delta^{(p+1)}_\phi d_{\phi,h} \tag{1.17}$$

and its analogous for the coderivative

$$d^*_{\phi,h}\Delta^{(p+1)}_\phi = \Delta^{(p)}_\phi d^*_{\phi,h}. \tag{1.18}$$

For any $p = 0,\dots,d$, $\Delta^{(p)}_\phi$ is self-adjoint, non-negative and thanks to Assumption 1.2, there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that $\sigma_{ess}(\Delta^{(p)}_\phi) \subset [c_0, +\infty[$ for any $h > 0$ small enough (in the case where X is a compact manifold, $\Delta^{(p)}_\phi$ has actually compact resolvent). Moreover, there exists $\epsilon_p > 0$ such that for $h > 0$ small enough, it has exactly n_p eigenvalues in the interval $[0, \epsilon_p h]$ where n_p denotes the number of critical points of index p of ϕ. We shall denote by $E^{(p)}$ the spectral subspace associated to these small eigenvalues of $\Delta^{(p)}_\phi$. Then $\dim E^{(p)} = n_p$ and relations (1.17), (1.18) show that

$$d_{\phi,h}(E^{(p)}) \subset E^{(p+1)} \text{ and } d^*_{\phi,h}(E^{(p+1)}) \subset E^{(p)} \tag{1.19}$$

This shows in particular that $d_{\phi,h}$ acts from $E^{(0)}$ into $E^{(1)}$ and we shall denote by $\mathcal{L}$ this operator. Similarly $\Delta^{(0)}_\phi$ acts on $E^{(0)}$ and we denote by $\mathcal{M}$ this operator. By (1.16), we get

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}^*\mathcal{L}.$$

The general strategy used in [5] (that we will follow in the present work), is to construct appropriate bases of $E^{(0)}$ and $E^{(1)}$ in which one can compute handily the singular values of $\mathcal{L}$. The main idea to construct such bases is to build accurate quasimodes for Δ_ϕ and to project these quasimodes on the $E^{(j)}$. The quasimodes for 1-forms are the one constructed in [7]. The main properties of these quasimodes will be recalled in section 2.3. Concerning the quasimodes on 0-forms one can not use the one constructed in [5], since many important properties that are required for our analysis fail to be true in the present situation (for instance, the quasi-orthogonality). In the section below, we construct a family of quasimodes on 0-forms that is adapted to our setting. As usual, each quasimode will be associated to a minimum $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$. The first step in our analysis is to construct a partition of the minima in such a way that the quasimode corresponding to different subsets of the partitions do not interact. This is done by mean of the equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$. Computing the matrix $\mathcal{L}$ in the corresponding basis, one arrives to a block diagonal matrix whose singular values are the singular values of each block.

However, given two minima $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}'$ in the same equivalence class, one has not necessarily $S(\mathbf{m}) = S(\mathbf{m}')$. For equivalence classes satisfying this property (that is assumption H(1,n)), each block of the matrix $\mathcal{L}$ has a typical size $e^{-S(\mathbf{m})/h}$ and the situation can be handled quite easily. But more complicated cases may arise where quasimodes yielding different heights $S(\mathbf{m})$ are interacting. In this paper, we treat the case where assumption H(2,n) is verified, that is we have at most two different heights interacting.

Acknowledgement: The author would like to thank D. Le Peutrec for his remarks on section 5.3, which permitted to improve the exposition. This paper was written while the author was in leave at Stanford University and U.C. Berkeley. He was supported by the European Research Council, ERC-2012-ADG, project number 320845: Semi Classical

Analysis of Partial Differential Equations, by the Stanford Mathematic Department and by the France Berkeley Fund, FBF 2016-0071, Semiclassical study of randomness and dynamics.

2. Construction of adapted quasimodes

2.1. **Gathering minima by equivalence class.** Let us start this section with a proposition collecting some elementary facts about E, E_- and $\widehat{E}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$. Then, we have the following*

i) If $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$, then:
- i.a) $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap E(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$
- i.b) *either* $E_-(\mathbf{m}) = E_-(\mathbf{m}')$ *or* $E_-(\mathbf{m}) \cap E_-(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$
- i.c) *if* $E_-(\mathbf{m}) = E_-(\mathbf{m}')$ *then* $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}')$ *otherwise* $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) \cap \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$

ii) If $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$, then
- ii.a) *either* $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap E(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$ *or* $E_-(\mathbf{m}') \subset E(\mathbf{m})$
- ii.b) *if one assumes additionally that* $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \neq \underline{\mathbf{m}}$, *then either* $E_-(\mathbf{m}) \cap E_-(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$ *or* $E_-(\mathbf{m}') \subset E_-(\mathbf{m})$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$ be two minima. Assume first that $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}') = \sigma$. Since $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1}(\infty) = \{\underline{\mathbf{m}}\}$, then one has necessarily $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$. In particular, $E_-(\nu), \widehat{E}(\nu)$, $\nu = \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}'$ are well-defined. Moreover, $E(\mathbf{m})$ and $E(\mathbf{m}')$ being two connected components of $\{\phi < \sigma\}$, one has either $E(\mathbf{m}) = E(\mathbf{m}')$ or $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap E(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$. Since $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$ and E is injective, then $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap E(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$, which proves i.a).

Since $E_-(\mathbf{m})$ and $E_-(\mathbf{m}')$ are two connected component of the same set $\{\phi < \tau\}$ for some $\tau > \sigma(\mathbf{m})$, then i.b) is obvious.

Suppose now that $E_-(\mathbf{m}) = E_-(\mathbf{m}')$, then the equality $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}')$ follows from the definition of $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$ (which roughly speaking is the unique connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma(\mathbf{m})\} \cap E_-(\mathbf{m})$ that was labelled before $E(\mathbf{m})$). If $E_-(\mathbf{m})$ and $E_-(\mathbf{m}')$ are disjoint, then $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$ and $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}')$ are also disjoint since $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) \subset E_-(\mathbf{m})$ and $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}') \subset E_-(\mathbf{m}')$. This completes the proof of i.c).

Let us now prove ii) and assume that $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$. Once again, since $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1}(\infty) = \{\underline{\mathbf{m}}\}$, then $\mathbf{m}' \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$. If $\overline{E(\mathbf{m}')} \cap \overline{E(\mathbf{m})} \neq \varnothing$, then $E_-(\mathbf{m}') \cap E(\mathbf{m}) \neq \varnothing$. Moreover, $E_-(\mathbf{m}')$ is a connected component of $\{\phi < \tau\}$ for some $\tau \leq \sigma(\mathbf{m})$. Since $E(\mathbf{m})$ is a connected component of $\{\phi < \sigma(\mathbf{m})\} \supset \{\phi < \tau\}$, then $E_-(\mathbf{m}') \subset E(\mathbf{m})$ which proves ii.a).

The point ii.b) is proved by similar arguments. □

Let us denote by $(\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{R}$ with $\mathcal{A}$ a finite set. We have evidently

$$\mathcal{U}^{(0)} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha \tag{2.1}$$

We need also to consider the set $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ defined by $\mathcal{A} = \underline{\mathcal{A}} \cup \{\underline{\alpha}\}$ where $\mathcal{U}_{\underline{\alpha}}^{(0)} = \{\underline{\mathbf{m}}\}$ is the equivalence class of the absolute minimum chosen for ϕ. Throughout, we will denote $q_\alpha = \sharp \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$. The applications $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, E_-, \widehat{E}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ are constant on $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$.*

Proof. For $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, it is a direct consequence of the definition. Suppose now that $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$ satisfy $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'$ and $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$. Suppose by contradiction that $E_-(\mathbf{m}) \neq E_-(\mathbf{m}')$. Since $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$, it follows from i.b) of Proposition 2.1 that $E_-(\mathbf{m}) \cap E_-(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$. On the other hand, by definition, there exists $\omega_1, \dots \omega_K \in \Omega_\sigma$ such that $\mathbf{m} \in \omega_1, \mathbf{m}' \in \omega_K$ and

$$\forall k = 1, \dots K-1, \, \overline{\omega_k} \cap \overline{\omega_{k+1}} \neq \varnothing$$

Since $\overline{\omega}_1 \subset E_-(\mathbf{m})$ and $\overline{\omega}_K \subset E_-(\mathbf{m}')$ is disjoint from $E_-(\mathbf{m})$ there exists k_0 such that $\overline{\omega}_{k_0} \subset E_-(\mathbf{m})$ and ω_{k_0+1} is not contained in $E_-(\mathbf{m})$. But since ω_{k_0+1} is a connected component of $\{\phi < \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m})\}$, then $\overline{\omega}_{k_0+1} \subset X \setminus E_-(\mathbf{m})$. This is in contradiction with $\overline{\omega_{k_0}} \cap \overline{\omega_{k_0+1}} \neq \varnothing$.

The statement on $\widehat{E}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ is now a consequence of the statement for E_- and i.c) of Proposition 2.1. □

Given $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, we will denote respectively $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha), E_-(\alpha), \widehat{E}(\alpha)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}), E_-(\mathbf{m}), \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}), \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})$ for some $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$. This is possible thanks to the preceding proposition. For $n \geq 2$, we define

$$\mathcal{A}^{\leq n} = \{\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}, \, \exists \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}, \, S(\mathbf{m}) \geq S_n\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Under Hypothesis H(2,n), there exist some maps $\nu_- : \mathcal{A}^{\leq n} \to \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\nu_+ : \mathcal{A}^{\leq n} \to \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$, one has $\nu_+(\alpha) \geq \nu_-(\alpha)$ and*

$$\forall \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}, \, S(\mathbf{m}) \in \{S_{\nu_-(\alpha)}, S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}\}.$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Hypothesis H(2,n). □

These applications induce a partition of the set $\mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$ into two parts, $\mathcal{A}^{\leq n} = \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n} \cup \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$ with

$$\mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}, \, \nu_-(\alpha) = \nu_+(\alpha)\} \text{ and } \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}, \, \nu_-(\alpha) < \nu_+(\alpha)\} \tag{2.3}$$

For $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$, we denote $\nu(\alpha) = \nu_-(\alpha) = \nu_+(\alpha)$. In the construction of our quasimodes on 0-forms, we need also to compare the values taken by ϕ on $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ with $\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha))$. For any $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, let $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),I} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)} \cap \mathcal{U}^{(0),I}$ and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)} \cap \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}$. Observe that for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$ one has either $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),I} = \varnothing$ or $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II} = \varnothing$. This is not the case if one takes $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$.

Let us now decompose the set of separating saddle points according to the equivalence classes. Given $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, introduce the closed set

$$G(\alpha) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}} \overline{E(\mathbf{m})} \tag{2.4}$$

and for any $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ let

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}, \, \phi(\mathbf{s}) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha)\} \cap G(\alpha). \tag{2.5}$$

For any $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)} \cup \{\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)\} \tag{2.6}$$

and define an application Γ_α from $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ into the closed subset of X by

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) = \Gamma(\mathbf{m}) \text{ if } \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)} \\ \Gamma_\alpha(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)) = \partial(\widehat{E}(\alpha) \cap \{\phi < \sigma(\alpha)\}). \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Remark 2.4. *Since $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) \subsetneq E(\hat{\mathbf{m}})$, then the application Γ_α is slightly different from the application Γ defined in section 1.2. Observe also that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$, $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m})$ is the boundary of the connected component of $\{\phi < \phi(\mathbf{s})\}$ that contains $\mathbf{m}$.*

Lemma 2.5. *The collection $(\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)})_{\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. Moreover, for all $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$, there exists $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ such that*

$$\{\mathbf{s}\} = \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_1) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_2) \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover, one can chose $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2$ in order that $S(\mathbf{m}_1) \leq S(\mathbf{m}_2)$ (that is $\phi(\mathbf{m}_1) \geq \phi(\mathbf{m}_2)$). Up to permutation, the couple $(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$ is unique.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$, then $\phi(\mathbf{s}) \in \underline{\Sigma}$ and there exists $k \geq 2$ such that $\phi(\mathbf{s}) = \sigma_k$. By definition, there exists two different connected components E_1, E_2 of $\{\phi < \sigma_k\}$ such that $\mathbf{s} \in \overline{E}_1 \cap \overline{E}_2$. From the existence part of Remark 1.2 there exists $\mathbf{m}_{l,i} \in E_1$ and $\mathbf{m}_{l',i'} \in E_2$ with $l' \leq l \leq k$. Moreover, one has necessarily $l = k$. Otherwise $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}_{l,i}) > \sigma_k$ and since $\overline{E}_1 \cap \overline{E}_2 \neq \varnothing$, it follows that $\mathbf{m}_{l',i'} \in E(\mathbf{m}_{l,i})$ which is impossible since $l' \leq l$. Hence we have $l = k$. Therefore E_1 is equal to $E(\mathbf{m}_{l,i})$ with $\mathbf{m}_{l,i} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, which proves that $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$. Moreover, E_2 is either of the form $E_2 = E(\mathbf{m}_{l',i'})$ with $\mathbf{m}_{l',i'} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ (if $l' = k$) or $E_2 = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}_{l,i})$ (if $l' < k$). Setting $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{m}_{l,i} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{m}_{l',i'} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$, one has $\mathbf{s} = \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_1) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_2)$ and since $l \geq l'$ one has also $\phi(\mathbf{m}_1) \geq \phi(\mathbf{m}_2)$.

Let us now prove that the union is disjoint. Suppose that $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{V}_\beta^{(1)}$. Then $\sigma(\alpha) = \phi(\mathbf{s}) = \sigma(\beta)$. Moreover, there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}_\beta^{(0)}$ such that $\mathbf{s} \in \overline{E(\mathbf{m})} \cap \overline{E(\mathbf{m}')}$. This proves that $\mathbf{m} \mathcal{R} \mathbf{m}'$ and hence $\alpha = \beta$.

The uniqueness of $(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2)$ up to permutation is obvious. □

2.2. **Quasimodes for 0-forms.** In this section we construct a family of quasimodes of $\Delta_\phi^{(0)}$ associated to the minima of ϕ. Each of these quasimodes will be of the form $x \mapsto h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \chi(x) e^{-\phi(x))/h}$ with some suitable cut-off functions χ.

Following [5], we can associate to each minima $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ a cut-off function $\chi_{\mathbf{m}}$ in the following way. For $\mathbf{m} = \underline{\mathbf{m}}$, we simply take $\chi_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}} = 1$. For $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$ we introduce some small parameters $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and we define

$$E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}) = \Big(E(\mathbf{m}) \setminus \bigcup_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cap \Gamma(\mathbf{m})} B(\mathbf{s}, \epsilon)\Big) + B(0, \delta) \tag{2.9}$$

Then, we let $\chi_{\mathbf{m}}$ be any function in $\mathscr{C}_c^\infty(E_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}))$ such that $\chi_{\mathbf{m}} = 1$ on $E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m})$.

Proposition 2.6. *There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, the following hold true:*

a) if $x \in \mathrm{supp}(\chi_{\mathbf{m}})$ and $\phi(x) < \sigma(\mathbf{m})$, then $x \in E(\mathbf{m})$

b) there exists $C > 0$ and for all ϵ, there exists $c_\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathrm{supp}(\nabla\chi_{\mathbf{m}})$, we have

- *either $x \notin \cup_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{V}^{(1)}\cap\Gamma(\mathbf{m})} B(\mathbf{s},\epsilon)$ and*

$$\sigma(\mathbf{m}) + c_\epsilon^{-1} < \phi(x) < \sigma(\mathbf{m}) + c_\epsilon$$

- *or $x \in \cup_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{V}^{(1)}\cap\Gamma(\mathbf{m})} B(\mathbf{s},\epsilon)$ and*

$$|\phi(x) - \sigma(\mathbf{m})| \le C\epsilon.$$

c) for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)} \setminus \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$, one has $dist(\mathbf{s}, \mathrm{supp}\,\nabla\chi_{\mathbf{m}}) \ge 3\epsilon$. If moreover $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{supp}(\chi_{\mathbf{m}})$, then $\mathbf{s} \in E(\mathbf{m})$.

d) suppose that $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cap \mathrm{supp}(\chi_{\mathbf{m}})$. Then, there exists $\beta \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\beta) < \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha)$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\beta^{(1)}$ and $\cup_{\mathbf{m}'\in\mathcal{U}_\beta^{(0)}} E(\mathbf{m}') \subset \{x \in X,\ \chi_{\mathbf{m}}(x) = 1\}$.

Proof. It is an adaptation of the proof of Proposition 4.2 in [5]. □

We are now in position to define the quasimodes in a recursive way on the values of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha)$.

- We start with the quasimode associated to $\underline{\mathbf{m}}$. We set

$$f_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}^{(0)}(x) = c(\underline{\mathbf{m}}, h) h^{-d/4} e^{(\phi(\underline{\mathbf{m}})-\phi(x))/h} \tag{2.10}$$

where $c(\underline{\mathbf{m}}, h)$ is a normalizing constant such that $\|f_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}\|_{L^2} = 1$. Due to the fact that ϕ may have several global minima, the function $f_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}^{(0)}$ doesn't concentrate only on $\underline{\mathbf{m}}$ but on the reunion of all global minima. Hence the normalizing factor $c(\underline{\mathbf{m}}, h)$ is computed by adding the contributions coming from each of these minima via quadratic approximation. More precisely, it follows from the Laplace method that $c(\underline{\mathbf{m}}, h) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} h^k \gamma_k(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ with the function γ_0 given by

$$\gamma_0(\mathbf{m})^{-2} = \pi^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}'\in H(\mathbf{m})} |\det \mathrm{Hess}\,\phi(\mathbf{m}')|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.11}$$

where by definition (1.7) one has

$$H(\mathbf{m}) := \{\mathbf{m}' \in E(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{U}^{(0)},\ \phi(\mathbf{m}') = \phi(\mathbf{m})\}.$$

Eventually, observe that $f_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}^{(0)}$ is an exact quasimode: $\Delta_\phi f_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}^{(0)} = 0$.

- Suppose now that $k \in \{2, \dots, K\}$ and that the quasimodes $f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}$ have been constructed for $\mathbf{m} \in \bigcup_{\alpha'\in\underline{\mathcal{A}}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha')\le\sigma_{k-1}} \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, and let us define $f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}$ for $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha) = \sigma_k$. The form of the quasimode associated to $\mathbf{m}$ depends on the type of $\mathbf{m}$ as introduced in Definition 1.3.

⋆ If $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I, then we define the $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}$ as usual by

$$f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}(x) = c(\mathbf{m},h)h^{-d/4}\chi_{\mathbf{m}}(x)e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h} \tag{2.12}$$

where $\chi_{\mathbf{m}}$ is the cut-off function associated to $\mathbf{m}$ that was defined above and $c(\mathbf{m},h))$ is again a normalizing constant such that $\|f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}\|_{L^2} = 1$. As before, we have to add all the contributions of minima in $E(\mathbf{m})$ at the same height as $\mathbf{m}$. We get $c(\mathbf{m},h) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} h^k\gamma_k(\mathbf{m})$ with $\gamma_0(\mathbf{m})$ given by (2.11).

⋆ Let us now construct quasimodes associated to minima $\mathbf{m}$ of type II. We assume here that $\mathcal{U}^{(0),II} \neq \varnothing$ and we define

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha} = \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}_{\alpha} \cup \{\hat{\mathbf{m}}\}. \tag{2.13}$$

where for short, we denote $\hat{\mathbf{m}} = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)$ and $q^{II}_{\alpha} = \sharp\mathcal{U}^{(0),II}_{\alpha}$.
Let us introduce an additional cut-off function around $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ that we define as follows. Recall that $\widehat{E}(\alpha)$ denotes the connected component of $\{x \in E_-(\mathbf{m}),\ \phi(x) < \sigma(\mathbf{m})\}$ that contains $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$. As before, we introduce some parameters $\epsilon,\delta > 0$ and define

$$\widehat{E}_{\epsilon,\delta}(\alpha) = \Big(\widehat{E}(\alpha) \setminus \bigcup_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{V}^{(1)}\cap\partial\widehat{E}(\alpha)} B(\mathbf{s},\epsilon)\Big) + B(0,\delta) \tag{2.14}$$

Then, we let $\hat{\chi}_{\hat{\mathbf{m}}}$ be any function in $\mathscr{C}^{\infty}_c(\widehat{E}_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\alpha))$ such that $\hat{\chi}_{\hat{\mathbf{m}}} = 1$ on $\widehat{E}_{\epsilon,\delta}(\alpha)$. For $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}_{\alpha}$, we let $\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}} = \chi_{\mathbf{m}}$, with $\chi_{\mathbf{m}}$ defined just below (2.9). We want to construct the quasimode as linear combination of the $\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}}e^{-\phi/h}$, $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}_{\alpha}$. In order to chose the coefficients, let us introduce $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha} = \mathscr{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha})$ the finite vector space of functions from $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha}$ into $\mathbb{R}$. This space has dimension $q^{II}_{\alpha}+1$ and is endowed with the usual euclidean structure

$$\langle\theta,\theta'\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_{\alpha}} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha}} \theta(\mathbf{m})\theta'(\mathbf{m}).$$

We denote by N the associated norm. Eventually, we define $\theta^{\alpha}_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$ by

$$\theta^{\alpha}_0(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{c^{\alpha}_0(h)}{c(\mathbf{m},h)} \tag{2.15}$$

where $c(\mathbf{m},h)$ is the unique positive constant such that the function

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}} := c(\mathbf{m},h)h^{-\frac{d}{4}}\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}}e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h}$$

satisfies $\|\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}\|_{L^2} = 1$ and $c^{\alpha}_0(h)$ is defined by $N(\theta^{\alpha}_0) = 1$. Let us now extend the definition of the set $H(\mathbf{m})$ in the following way. Given $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$ we define

$$\widehat{H}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{m}) = \begin{cases} H(\mathbf{m}) \text{ if } \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha} \\ \{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{E}(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{U}^{(0)}, \phi(\mathbf{m}') = \phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}})\} \text{ if } \mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha} \setminus \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha} \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

Observe that if α is of type II, since $E(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha))$ is larger than $\widehat{E}(\alpha)$, then $H(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha))$ and $\widehat{H}_{\alpha}((\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha))$ may be different. From the preceding definition, it

follows that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II}$, $c(\mathbf{m},h)$ admits a classical expansion $c(\mathbf{m},h) = \sum_k h^k \gamma_k(\mathbf{m})$ with

$$\gamma_0(\mathbf{m})^{-2} = \pi^{\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{H}_\alpha(\mathbf{m})} |\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{m}')|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.17}$$

Therefore, we can compute the constant $c_0^\alpha(h)$, and we get

$$c_0^\alpha(h) = \pi^{-\frac{d}{4}} \Big(\sum_{\nu \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{H}_\alpha(\nu)} |\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{m}')|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{O}(h).$$

Here the index α is used to indicate that the function is associated to $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}$.

Lemma 2.7. *There exists some functions $\theta_1^\alpha, \dots, \theta_{q_\alpha^{II}}^\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ such that $\{\theta_j^\alpha, j = 0, \dots, q_\alpha^{II}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$. Moreover, the functions θ_j^α admit a classical expansion*

$$\theta_j^\alpha = \sum_{k \geq 0} h^k \theta_j^{\alpha,k}$$

and for all $j \geq 1$, the leading terms $\theta_j^{\alpha,0}$ are orthogonal to the function $\theta_0^{\alpha,0}(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{c_0^\alpha(0)}{\gamma_0(\mathbf{m})}$.

Proof. It suffices to chose any orthonormal basis of $(\theta_0^\alpha)^\perp$ which is a q_α^{II} dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$. □

Observe that since $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}$ has q_α^{II} elements, the functions $\theta_1^\alpha, \dots, \theta_{q_\alpha^{II}}^\alpha$ can also be indexed by $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}$ using any arbitrary bijection. We end up with a family of functions $(\theta_{\mathbf{m}}^\alpha)_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}}$ and for convenience we will also denote $\theta_{\hat{\mathbf{m}}}^\alpha = \theta_0^\alpha$. Then, we define the q_α^{II} quasimodes associated to $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}$ by

$$f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}(x) = h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II}} \theta_{\mathbf{m}}^\alpha(\mathbf{m}') c(\mathbf{m}',h) \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x) e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h} \tag{2.18}$$

where the normalization factor $c(\mathbf{m}',h)$ is defined above and insures that

$$\| c(\mathbf{m}',h) \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x) e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h} \|_{L^2} = 1.$$

Before going further and as a preparation for the final analysis we would like to write the quasimode given by (2.12) and (2.18) in the same fashion. For this purpose, we define $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),I} \cup \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II} \tag{2.19}$$

with the convention that $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II} = \varnothing$ if $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II} = \varnothing$ (observe that $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ is equal to the set $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ defined in 2.6 if and only if $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II} \neq \varnothing$). Then, we define $\theta_{\mathbf{m}}^\alpha(\mathbf{m}')$ for any $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}, \mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ in the following way:

- if $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II}$, we keep the above definition.
- otherwise, we set

$$\theta^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}') = \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}. \tag{2.20}$$

Then formula (2.12) and (2.18) can be summarized in

$$f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}(x) = h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}} \theta^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}') c(\mathbf{m}', h) \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x) e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h} \tag{2.21}$$

with $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$ and θ^{α} as above.

Definition 2.8. *For any $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, let us denote by $\mathscr{T}^{\alpha}$ the matrix given by*

$$\mathscr{T}^{\alpha} = (\theta^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}')))_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha}}$$

Let us remark that if all points of $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$ are of type I, then $\mathscr{T}^{\alpha}$ is just the $q_{\alpha} \times q_{\alpha}$ identity matrix, whereas if $\mathcal{U}^{(0),II}_{\alpha} \neq \varnothing$ it is a $(q_{\alpha}+1) \times q_{\alpha}$ matrix.

For any $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, let us introduce the set $F(\mathbf{m})$ defined as follows. If $\mathbf{m} = \underline{\mathbf{m}}$, let $F(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) = X$. If $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),I}$, let $F(\mathbf{m}) = \overline{E(\mathbf{m})}$ and if $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}$ let

$$F(\mathbf{m}) = \Big(\bigcup_{\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}_{\alpha}} \overline{E(\mathbf{m}')} \Big) \cup \overline{\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})} \tag{2.22}$$

where α is such that $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$. Observe that we always have $\overline{E(\mathbf{m})} \subset F(\mathbf{m})$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be such that $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$. The following hold true*

i) if $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'$ then
- i.a) *if $\mathbf{m}$ or $\mathbf{m}'$ is of type I, then $F(\mathbf{m}) \cap F(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$.*
- i.b) *if $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are both of type II, then $F(\mathbf{m}) = F(\mathbf{m}')$.*

ii) If $\mathbf{m}' \notin \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})$, then
- ii.a) *if $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$, then $F(\mathbf{m}) \cap F(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$.*
- ii.b) *if $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$, then either $F(\mathbf{m}) \cap F(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$ or $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}(\mathbf{m})$*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'$ with $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$. As in the proof of Proposition 2.1, one has necessarily $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \neq \underline{\mathbf{m}}$. Assume first that $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I. Then $F(\mathbf{m}) = \overline{E(\mathbf{m})}$. If $\mathbf{m}'$ is also of type I, then $F(\mathbf{m}') = \overline{E(\mathbf{m}')}$. Moreover since $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$, it follows from i.a) of Proposition 2.1 that $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap E(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$. Therefore, $F(\mathbf{m}) \cap F(\mathbf{m}')$ is either empty or is reduced to a union of saddle points which are separating by definition. If $\mathbf{m}'$ is of type II, the same proof works. This completes the proof of i.a).

Suppose now that $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are both of type II. Since $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'$, it follows that $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}')$ and hence $F(\mathbf{m}) = F(\mathbf{m}')$ which shows i.b).

Suppose now that $\mathbf{m}' \notin \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})$. Consider first the case where $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$. Then, one has necessarily $F(\mathbf{m}) \cap F(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$ otherwise we would have $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'$.

Suppose now that $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$ and that $F(\mathbf{m}) \cap F(\mathbf{m}') \neq \varnothing$. If $\mathbf{m} = \underline{\mathbf{m}}$, then $F(\mathbf{m}) = X$ and the conclusion is obvious. Suppose now that $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$ and consider first the case where $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are of type I. Then $F(\mathbf{m}) = \overline{E(\mathbf{m})}$ and $F(\mathbf{m}') = \overline{E(\mathbf{m}')}$ and ii.a) of Proposition 2.1 shows that $E_{-}(\mathbf{m}') \subset E(\mathbf{m})$. Hence $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset E(\mathbf{m}) = \mathring{F}(\mathbf{m})$. If $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I and $\mathbf{m}'$

of type II, then one has $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap \tilde{E} \neq \varnothing$ with either $\tilde{E} = E(\mathbf{m}'')$, $\mathbf{m}'' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ (with α such that $\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$) or $\tilde{E} = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$. As before, one get $E_-(\mathbf{m}'') \subset E(\mathbf{m})$ and the same proof works.

Let us now suppose that $\mathbf{m}$ is of type II and $\mathbf{m}'$ is of type I. Then $E(\mathbf{m}') \cap \tilde{E} \neq \varnothing$ with either $\tilde{E} = E(\mathbf{m}'')$ for some $\mathbf{m}'' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ (with α such that $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$) or $\tilde{E} = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$. In both cases one sees easily that $E_-(\mathbf{m}') \subset \tilde{E}$ which proves the result.

The case where both $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are of type II is left to the reader. □

Let us now give some informations on the support of the quasimodes. For $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$, let us introduce the set

$$F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}) = \Big(F(\mathbf{m}) \setminus \bigcup_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cap \partial F(\mathbf{m})} B(\mathbf{s}, \epsilon)\Big) + B(0, \delta) \tag{2.23}$$

If $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I, it is clear that $F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}) = \overline{E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m})}$ and if $\mathbf{m}$ is of type II, one has

$$F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}) = \overline{\widehat{E}_{\epsilon,\delta}(\alpha)} \cup \big(\cup_{\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}} \overline{E_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m})}\big)$$

From the above construction and the preceding proposition, one deduces immediately the following result on the support of the quasimodes.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, then*

- *if $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I, then $\mathrm{supp}(f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}) \subset F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m})$ and $d_{\phi,h} f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}$ is supported in a δ-neighbourhood of $\Gamma(\mathbf{m})$.*
- *if $\mathbf{m}$ is of type II, then $\mathrm{supp}(f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}) \subset F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m})$ with and $d_{\phi,h} f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}$ is supported in a δ-neighbourhood of $\partial F(\mathbf{m})$.*

The family of quasimode that we constructed is quasi-orthonormal in the following sense.

Proposition 2.11. *There exists $\beta > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, one has*

$$\langle f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}, f_{\mathbf{m}'}^{(0)} \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}'$ be two minima.

• Consider first the case where $\mathbf{m} \mathcal{R} \mathbf{m}'$. If $\mathbf{m} = \underline{\mathbf{m}}$, one has necessarily $\mathbf{m}' = \mathbf{m}$ and hence $\langle f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}, f_{\mathbf{m}'}^{(0)} \rangle = \|f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}\|^2 = 1$ by construction. Consider now the case where $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \neq \underline{\mathbf{m}}$ and suppose first that $\mathbf{m}$ or $\mathbf{m}'$ is of type I. From Proposition 2.10, we know that $f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}$ and $f_{\mathbf{m}'}^{(0)}$ are supported in $F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m})$ and $F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}')$ respectively. Moreover, thanks to i.a) of Proposition 2.9 and the fact that $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cap \partial F_{\epsilon,\delta} = \varnothing$, one can chose δ sufficiently small, so that $F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}) \cap F_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$. Therefore, $\mathrm{supp}(f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(f_{\mathbf{m}'}^{(0)}) = \varnothing$ and hence $f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}$ and $f_{\mathbf{m}'}^{(0)}$ are orthogonal.

Suppose now that $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ are both of type II. Then, we can write

$$f_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)}(x) = h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}} \theta_{\mathbf{m}}(\nu_1) c(\nu_1, h) \hat{\chi}_{\nu_1}(x) e^{(\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})) - \phi(x))/h}$$

$$f_{\mathbf{m}'}^{(0)}(x) = h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}} \theta_{\mathbf{m}'}(\nu_2) c(\nu_2, h) \hat{\chi}_{\nu_2}(x) e^{(\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})) - \phi(x))/h}.$$

Since for $\nu_2 \neq \nu_1$, $\hat{\chi}_{\nu_1}$ and $\hat{\chi}_{\nu_2}$ have again disjoint support, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle &= h^{-\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\nu\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}} \theta_{\mathbf{m}}(\nu)\theta_{\mathbf{m}'}(\nu)|c(\nu,h)|^2 \int_X |\hat{\chi}_\nu(x)|^2 e^{2(\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}))-\phi(x))/h}dx \\ &= \langle \theta_{\mathbf{m}}, \theta_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha} = \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}\end{aligned}$$

This shows in particular that $\|f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}\|_{L^2} = 1$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$.

• Suppose now, that $\mathbf{m}' \notin \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})$ (in particular $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}'$). If $\sigma(\mathbf{m}') = \sigma(\mathbf{m})$ then $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}$ are supported respectively in $F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}) \subset F(\mathbf{m}) + B(0,2\delta)$ and $F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}') \subset F(\mathbf{m}') + B(0,2\delta)$ which turns out to be disjoint thanks to ii.a) of Proposition 2.9. This proves that $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}$ and $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}$ are orthogonal.

Consider now the case where $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) \neq \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$, let say $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$. From ii.b) of Proposition 2.9, we know that either $F(\mathbf{m}')$ is disjoint from $F(\mathbf{m})$ or $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}(\mathbf{m})$. In the first case, we get immediately $\langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle = 0$ by the same argument as before. Suppose we are in the second situation, that is $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}(\mathbf{m})$. By definition, we have $\phi(\mathbf{m}) \leq \phi(\mathbf{m}')$, and by taking $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ small enough we can insure that $F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m})$.

Suppose first that $\phi(\mathbf{m}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}')$. A priori we don't know if $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}'$ are of type I or II. However, since $F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m})$, then

$$\langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle = \int_{F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}')} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}(x) f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x)dx.$$

and

$$(f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}})_{|F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}')} = \tilde{c}(\mathbf{m},h)h^{-\frac{d}{4}}e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h} \tag{2.24}$$

where the constant $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{m},h)$ is uniformly bounded with respect to h. This is clear if $\mathbf{m}$ is of type I. If $\mathbf{m}$ is of type II and let say $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$, then $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}(\mathbf{m})$ implies that there exists $\nu \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$ such that $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset E(\nu)$ (or $\widehat{E}(\nu)$). Then the general formula (2.18) shows (2.24). Moreover, by construction, there exists a cut-off function $\psi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathring{F}_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}))$ independent of h such that $\inf_{\mathrm{supp}\,\psi}\phi = \phi(\mathbf{m}')$ and

$$|f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x)| \leq h^{-d/4}\psi(x)e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m}')-\phi(x))/h}$$

and it follows that

$$|\langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle| \leq Ch^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int \psi(x)e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m}')+\phi(\mathbf{m})-2\phi(x))/h}dx \leq C'h^{-d/2}e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(\mathbf{m}'))/h}$$

Since $\phi(\mathbf{m}') > \phi(\mathbf{m})$, this proves the result.

It remains to study the case where $\phi(\mathbf{m}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}')$. Let $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha'}$. From the above assumption, one has also $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$ and $F(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}(\mathbf{m})$. Since $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) > \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$ and $\phi(\mathbf{m}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}')$ then $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}$ is necessarily of type II. It has the form (2.18) and since $F_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m}') \subset \mathring{F}_{\epsilon,2\delta}(\mathbf{m})$, then (2.24) still holds true. Hence, we get

$$\langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle = \tilde{c}(\mathbf{m},h)h^{-\frac{d}{2}} \sum_{\nu\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha'}} \theta_{\mathbf{m}'}(\nu)c(\nu,h) \int \hat{\chi}_\nu(x)e^{2(\phi(x)-\phi(\mathbf{m}))/h}dx \tag{2.25}$$

On the other hand, by a standard argument based on Laplace method, we know that there exists $r>0$ and $\beta>0$ such that for all $\nu \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha'}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-\frac{d}{2}} c(\nu,h) \int \hat{\chi}_\nu(x) e^{2(\phi(x)-\phi(\mathbf{m}))/h} dx &= h^{-\frac{d}{2}} c(\nu,h) \sum_{\nu' \in H(\nu)} \int_{B(\nu',r)} e^{2(\phi(x)-\phi(\mathbf{m}))/h} dx + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}) \\ &= h^{-\frac{d}{2}} c(\nu,h) \int |\hat{\chi}_\nu(x)|^2 e^{2(\phi(x)-\phi(\mathbf{m}))/h} dx + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}) \\ &= \frac{1}{c(\nu,h)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}) \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this in (2.25), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'} \rangle &= \tilde{c}(\mathbf{m},h) \sum_{\nu \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_{\alpha'}} \theta_{\mathbf{m}'}(\nu) \frac{1}{c(\nu,h)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}) \\ &= \frac{\tilde{c}(\mathbf{m},h)}{c_0^{\alpha'}(h)} \langle \theta_{\mathbf{m}'}, \theta_0^{\alpha'} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_{\alpha'}} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Since $\theta_{\mathbf{m}'}$ is orthogonal to $\theta_0^{\alpha'}$ by construction, the first term of the right hand side above vanishes and we get $\langle f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'} \rangle = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h})$. This completes the proof. □

We end up this section by giving some exponential estimate of the action of $d_{\phi,h}$ on the quasimodes.

Lemma 2.12. *There exists $C>0$ such that for all $\epsilon>0$ small enough, we have*

$$d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S(\mathbf{m})-C\epsilon)/h})$$

for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$.

Proof. The result is classical, but since the quasimode $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}$ are slightly different from the usual one, we have to check the estimates. Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and let us compute $d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}$.

If $\mathbf{m} = \underline{\mathbf{m}}$, then $d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$ and there is nothing to do.

Suppose now that $\mathbf{m} \neq \underline{\mathbf{m}}$. From (2.21), one has

$$d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}(x) = h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha} \theta_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}') c(\mathbf{m}',h) \nabla \hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x) e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h}$$

All terms of the above sum corresponding to $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$ are $\mathcal{O}(e^{-(S(\mathbf{m})-C\epsilon)/h}$ thanks to b) of Proposition 2.6. The only new term is the one corresponding to $\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m})$. Since $\hat{\chi}_{\hat{\mathbf{m}}} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_c(\widehat{E}_{\epsilon,2\delta})$ and is equal to 1 on $\widehat{E}_{\epsilon,2\delta}$, we have again

$$\phi(x) - \phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}) = \phi(x) - \phi(\mathbf{m}) \geq S(\mathbf{m}) - C\epsilon$$

on $\mathrm{supp}(\nabla \hat{\chi}_{\hat{\mathbf{m}}})$ and the proof is complete. □

2.3. **Quasimodes for 1-forms.** This section is devoted to the quasimodes associated to low lying eigenvalues of $\Delta_\phi^{(1)}$. The construction of these quasimodes was done in [7] and we refer to that paper for all the proofs. Here, we just describe the main properties of these functions.

Given any saddle point $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}$, and any appropriate open neighborhood $\omega_\mathbf{s}$ of $\mathbf{s}$, let $P_{\phi,\mathbf{s}}$ denote the operator $\Delta_\phi^{(1)}$ restricted to $\omega_\mathbf{s}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let $u_\mathbf{s}$ denote a normalized fundamental state of $P_{\phi,\mathbf{s}}$. The quasimodes $f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ are then defined by

$$f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(x) := \varepsilon_0 \|\psi_\mathbf{s} u_\mathbf{s}\|^{-1} \psi_\mathbf{s}(x) u_\mathbf{s}(x), \tag{2.27}$$

where $\psi_\mathbf{s}$ is a well-chosen C_0^∞ localization function supported in $\omega_\mathbf{s}$ and equal to 1 near $\mathbf{s}$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \pm 1$ will be fixed later. By taking $\omega_\mathbf{s}$ sufficiently small, we can insure that the $f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ have disjoint support, and we immediately deduce

$$\langle f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}, f_{\mathbf{s}'}^{(1)} \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}'}. \tag{2.28}$$

In particular, the family $\{f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)},\ \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}\}$ is a free family of 1-forms. From [4] Proposition 5.2.6, one knows that the eigenvalues of $P_{\phi,\mathbf{s}}$ are exponentially small. Using Agmon estimates, it follows that there exists $\beta > 0$ independent of ε such that

$$\Delta_\phi^{(1)} f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}). \tag{2.29}$$

Combined with the spectral theorem, this proves that the n_1 eigenvalues of $\Delta_\phi^{(1)}$ in $[0, \epsilon_1 h]$ are actually $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h})$ (see [4] Proposition 5.2.5, for details).

Furthermore, Theorem 2.5 of [7] implies that these quasimodes have a WKB writing

$$f_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(x) = \varepsilon_0 h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \psi_\mathbf{s}(x) b_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(x,h) e^{-\phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}(x)/h}, \tag{2.30}$$

where $b_\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(x,h)$ is a 1-form having a semiclassical asymptotic, and $\phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}$ is the phase associated to the outgoing manifold of $\xi^2 + |\nabla_x \phi(x)|^2$ at $(\mathbf{s}, 0)$. In particular, the phase function $\phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}$ satisfies the eikonal equation $|\nabla_x \phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}|^2 = |\nabla_x \phi|^2$ and $\phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}(x) \sim |x - \mathbf{s}|^2$ near $\mathbf{s}$. For other properties of $\phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}$ we refer to [7].

2.4. **Projection onto the eigenspaces.** The next step in our analysis is to project the preceding quasimodes onto the generalized eigenspaces associated to exponentially small eigenvalues. Recall that we have built in the preceding section quasimodes $f_\mathbf{m}^{(0)}$, $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ with good orthogonality properties. To each quasimode we will associate a function in $E^{(0)}$, the eigenspace associated to $o(h)$ eigenvalues. For this, we first define the spectral projector

$$\Pi^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma (z - \Delta_\phi^{(0)})^{-1} dz, \tag{2.31}$$

where $\gamma = \partial B(0, \epsilon_0 h)$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ is such that $\sigma(\Delta_\phi) \subset [0, \epsilon_0 h]$. From the fact that $\Delta_\phi^{(0)}$ is selfadjoint, we get that

$$\Pi^{(0)} = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

We now introduce the projection of the quasimodes constructed above, $e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} = \Pi^{(0)}(f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}})$. We have the following

Lemma 2.13. *The system $(e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{U}^{(0)}}$ is free and spans $E^{(0)}$. Besides, there exists $\beta > 0$ independent of ε such that*

$$e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} = f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \langle e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}, e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta/h}).$$

for all $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$.

Proof. Using Proposition 2.11 and resolvent estimates as in [7], we get immediately the result. □

We can do a similar study for $\Delta^{(1)}_{\phi}$, for which we know that the n_1 eigenvalues lying in $[0, \epsilon_1 h]$ are actually $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha'/h})$. To the family of quasimodes $(f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}})_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{U}^{(1)}}$, we now associate a family of functions in $E^{(1)}$, the eigenspace associated to eigenvalues of $\Delta^{(1)}_{\phi}$ in $[0, \epsilon_1 h]$. Thanks to the spectral properties of the selfadjoint operator $\Delta^{(1)}_{\phi}$, its spectral projector onto $E^{(1)}$ is given by

$$\Pi^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma}(z - \Delta^{(1)}_{\phi})^{-1}dz, \tag{2.32}$$

where $\gamma = \partial B(0, \varepsilon_1 h)$ with ϵ_1 defined above. In the sequel, we denote $e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}} = \Pi^{(1)}(f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}})$. The family $(e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}})_{\mathbf{s}}$ satisfies the following estimates

Lemma 2.14. *The system $(e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}})_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{U}^{(1)}}$ is free and spans $E^{(1)}$. Besides, we have*

$$e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}} = f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta'/h}), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}'}\rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}'} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta'/h}).$$

with $\beta' > 0$ independent of ε.

Proof. Once again, using resolvent estimates as in [7], this follows from the orthonormality of the $f^{(1)}_{j}$ combined with (2.29). □

3. Preliminary for singular values analysis

This section is a preparation to the study of the singular values of the operator $\mathcal{L} : E^{(0)} \to E^{(1)}$ defined below (1.19). We simplify the forthcoming study by several reductions and changes of basis. Let us observe that the result of this section do not need Assumption H(2,n). Let us denote by $\mathcal{L}^{\pi}$ the $n_1 \times n_0$ matrix given by

$$\mathcal{L}^{\pi}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h}e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}\rangle, \ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \tag{3.1}$$

with $e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}$, $e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}$ defined in the preceding section. Since $(e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}})$ and $(e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}})$ are almost orthonormal bases (thanks to Lemma 2.13 and 2.14), this matrix is close to the matrix of the operator $\mathcal{L}$ in these bases.

Recall that $\underline{\mathbf{m}}$ denotes the absolute minimum of ϕ associated to the connected component $E(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) = X$. Since $\Delta_\phi^{(0)} e_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}} = 0$, the non zero singular values of $\mathcal{L}^\pi$ are exactly the singular values of the reduced matrix $\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime} = (\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{U}^{(1)},\mathbf{m}\in\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}} \in \mathscr{M}(\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)},\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ with $\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \setminus \{\underline{\mathbf{m}}\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists $\beta'' > 0$ such that for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, one has*

$$\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \langle f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S(\mathbf{m})+\beta'')/h})$$

for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}, \mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$.

Proof. The trick to get the good error estimate above is now well-known (see for instance proof of Prop. 5.8 in [8]) but we recall the proof for reader's convenience. Let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}, \mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$, then thanks to (1.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} e^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle &= \langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} \Pi^{(0)} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle = \langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, \Pi^{(1)} d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle = \langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle \\ &= \langle f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle + \langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}} - f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle\end{aligned}$$

But from Lemma 2.12, 2.14 and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality one gets

$$|\langle e^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}} - f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle| \leq C e^{-(\beta' + S(\mathbf{m}) - C\epsilon)/h}.$$

Since β' is independent of ϵ, one can conclude by taking ϵ small enough and $\beta'' = \beta'/2$. □

Let us denote $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime} \in \mathscr{M}(\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)},\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ the matrix defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \langle f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle, \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}, \mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} \tag{3.2}$$

As we shall se later, the singular values of $\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime}$ are exponentially close and it is natural to study the matrix $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime}$. For $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)} \setminus \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$, thanks to c) of Proposition 2.6 one has $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} = e^{-\phi/h}$ near $\mathbf{s}$, and hence

$$\langle f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Therefore, the singular values of $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime}$ are equal to the singular values of the reduced matrix $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime\prime} \in \mathscr{M}(\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)},\mathcal{V}^{(1)})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime\prime}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \langle f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}}, d_{\phi,h} f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}} \rangle, \ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}, \mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}. \tag{3.4}$$

In order to study this matrix, we need to introduce a new enumeration of critical points. Let us start with few abstract notations. Assume that $(\mathcal{I},\leq)$ and $(\mathcal{J},\leq)$ are two totally ordered sets and let $A = (a_{ij})_{i\in\mathcal{I},j\in\mathcal{J}}$ be the associated matrix (with i,j enumerated in increasing order). Assume that we have partitions $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ respectively

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_{N_\mathcal{I}}) \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{J}_1, \dots, \mathcal{J}_{N_\mathcal{J}})$$

Assume that each partition admits a total order $\preceq$ (that is we can compare the subset $\mathcal{I}_i$). Then we get a total order $\preceq$ on $\mathcal{I}$ (resp. $\mathcal{J}$) by using the associated lexicographical order:

$$i \preceq j \text{ iff } (\exists \mathcal{I}_\alpha \preceq \mathcal{I}_\beta,\ i \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{J}_\beta) \text{ or } (\exists \mathcal{I}_\alpha,\ i,j \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha \text{ and } i \leq j.)$$

Hence, there exists a unique $\alpha : (\mathcal{I}, \leq) \to (\mathcal{I}, \leq)$ which is strictly increasing (and hence bijective). Similarly, there is a unique $\beta : (\mathcal{J}, \leq) \to (\mathcal{J}, \leq)$ which is strictly increasing. We denote by $A_{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{J}}$ the matrix $(a_{\alpha(i),\beta(j)})_{i\in\mathcal{I}, j\in\mathcal{J}}$. This matrix is obtained from A by intertwining the basis vector, hence it has exactly the same singular values.

Let us go back to the matrix $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,''}$. Consider the partitions of $\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1)}$ given by

$$\mathcal{P}^{(0)} = \{\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha,\ \alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}\} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}^{(1)} = \{\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\beta,\ \beta \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}\}.$$

Endow $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ with any total order $\preceq$ such that $\boldsymbol{\sigma} : \underline{\mathcal{A}} \to \Sigma$ is decreasing and for all $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ chose any arbitrary total order on $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\beta$. This gives an order on the above partitions and we denote by $\mathscr{L} = (\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha,\beta\in\underline{\mathcal{A}}}$ the matrix $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,''}$ associated to these partitions. Observe here that each $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is itself a matrix $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\beta} = (\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\beta}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\beta, \mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha}$.

Lemma 3.2. *For all $\alpha \neq \beta$, $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\beta} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha;\beta \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\alpha \neq \beta$ and let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\beta$. If $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\beta)$ then $\alpha \neq \beta$ implies that $\mathbf{s} \notin F(\mathbf{m})$. Shrinking if necessary (by taking $\delta > 0$ small) the support of $f^{(0)}_\alpha$ and $e^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}$, it follows that these functions have disjoint supports so that their scalar product vanishes.

If $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha) \neq \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\beta)$, then thanks to Proposition 2.10, $d_{\phi,h}e^{(0)}_\mathbf{m}$ is supported near $\{\phi = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\alpha)\}$ whereas $e^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}$ is supported near $\{\phi = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\beta)\}$. Since this two sets are disjoints we get $\langle f^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}, d_{\phi,h}e^{(0)}_\mathbf{m}\rangle = 0$ and the proof is complete. □

From this lemma we deduce that the matrix $\mathscr{L}$ admits a block-diagonal structure

$$\mathscr{L} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathscr{L}^\alpha, \alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}) \tag{3.5}$$

with $\mathscr{L}^\alpha := \mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\alpha}$. Let us finish this section by exhibiting a last useful structure of the matrices $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$. Recall from Definition 2.8, that for any $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, the matrix $\mathscr{T}^\alpha \in \mathscr{M}(\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha, \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha)$ is given by $\mathscr{T}^\alpha = (\theta^\alpha_\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{m}'))_{\mathbf{m}'\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha, \mathbf{m}\in\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha}$.

Lemma 3.3. *We have $\mathscr{L}^\alpha = \widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}\mathscr{T}^\alpha$ where the matrix $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = (\hat{\ell}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}'})_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}'} \in \mathscr{M}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha, \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha)$ is given by*

$$\hat{\ell}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}'} = \langle f^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}, d_{\phi,h}g^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle,\ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha, \mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha$$

with $g^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x) = h^{-\frac{d}{4}}c(\mathbf{m}',h)\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x)e^{\phi(\mathbf{m}')-\phi(x)/h}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha, \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$. From equation (2.21), one has

$$\langle f^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}, d_{\phi,h}f^{(0)}_\mathbf{m}\rangle = h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \sum_{\mathbf{m}'\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha} \theta^\alpha_\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{m}')c(\mathbf{m}',h)\langle f^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}, hd\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}'}(x)e^{(\phi(\mathbf{m})-\phi(x))/h}\rangle$$

Moreover, the function ϕ being constant on $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0),II}_\alpha$, we can replace $\phi(\mathbf{m})$ by $\phi(\mathbf{m}')$ in the above identity and it follows that

$$\langle f^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}, d_{\phi,h}f^{(0)}_\mathbf{m}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{m}'\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha} \theta^\alpha_\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{m}')\langle f^{(1)}_\mathbf{s}, d_{\phi,h}g^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}'}\rangle$$

which is exactly the result to be proved. □

One of the crucial points of our analysis is to compute the coefficient $\hat{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$. Given $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$, we define

$$h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}) = \Big(\sum_{\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{H}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{m})} |\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{m})|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.6}$$

with $\widehat{H}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{m})$ defined in (2.16). One has clearly $h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}) = \pi^{\frac{d}{4}} \gamma_0(\mathbf{m})$ with γ_0 given by (2.17). Moreover, in the case where $H(\mathbf{m}) = \{\mathbf{m}\}$, one has $h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}) = |\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{m})|^{\frac{1}{4}}$. Given $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$, we denote by $\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})$ the unique negative eigenvalue of $\phi''(\mathbf{s})$. In order to keep uniform notations, we also extend the definition (3.6) to saddle points by

$$h_{\phi}(\mathbf{s}) = |\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Eventually, we introduce the matrix $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha}} = (\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}) \in \mathscr{M}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}, \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha})$ defined by

$$\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = e^{S(\mathbf{m})/h} \hat{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}, \ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha}, \mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha} \tag{3.7}$$

The following Lemma gives an asymptotic expansion of the coefficients $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha}$, $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$. One has the following properties:*

i) If $\mathbf{m} \notin \{\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})\}$, then $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = 0$.

i') If $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \notin \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$ (that is if α is of type I and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)$), then $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})} = 0$.

ii) The coefficients $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$ admits a classical expansion $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} \sim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k \geq 0} h^k \tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,k}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$. Moreover, one can chose $\varepsilon_0 = \pm 1$ in (2.27) in order that for $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$, the leading terms satisfy

$$\widetilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} = \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))}{h_{\phi}(\mathbf{s})} \tag{3.8}$$

and in the case where $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$,

$$\widetilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})} = -\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))}{h_{\phi}(\mathbf{s})}. \tag{3.9}$$

In particular, if $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha}$, one has

$$\frac{\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})}}{h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))} = -\frac{\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})}}{h_{\phi}(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))} \tag{3.10}$$

for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha}$.

Proof. Suppose first that $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$. Then, $\mathrm{supp}(d_{\phi,h} g^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}}) = \mathrm{supp}(d\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}})$ is contained in a small neighborhood ω of $\Gamma(\mathbf{m})$. Since $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$ it follows from Lemma 2.5 that $\mathbf{s} \notin \omega$ and hence $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = 0$ which proves *i*). If α is of type I, then $\mathbf{s} \in E(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha))$ and the same argument permit to prove i').

Let us now compute the coefficients $\tilde{\ell}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$ for $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_1(s), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$. Recall from (2.30), that the quasimodes on 1-forms are given by

$$f_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_0 h^{-\frac{d}{4}} \psi_{\mathbf{s}}(x) b_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)}(x,h) e^{-\phi_{+,\mathbf{s}}(x)/h}.$$

Summing up the construction of [5] section 4.2, there exists an open neighborhood $V_{\mathbf{s}}$ of $\mathbf{s}$ on which one can find a system of local Morse coordinates $(y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$) in which $\mathbf{s}$ is the origin and such that the following properties hold true:

(1) In the above coordinate system one has

$$\phi = \phi(\mathbf{s}) + \frac{1}{2}\big(\hat{\lambda}^1(\mathbf{s}) y^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{d} \hat{\lambda}_j(\mathbf{s}) z_j^2\big)$$

and

$$\phi_+ = \frac{1}{2}\big(- \hat{\lambda}^1(\mathbf{s}) y^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{d} \hat{\lambda}_j(\mathbf{s}) z_j^2\big)$$

where $(\hat{\lambda}_j(\mathbf{s}))_{j=1,\dots,d}$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathrm{Hess}(\phi)$ at point $\mathbf{s}$.

(2) One can chose the orientation of the y axis so that

$$E(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) \cap V_{\mathbf{s}} \subset \{y < 0\} \cap V_{\mathbf{s}} \text{ and } E(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})) \cap V_{\mathbf{s}} \subset \{y > 0\} \cap V_{\mathbf{s}}.$$

(3) In $V_{\mathbf{s}}$ the functions $\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}_j}$, $j = 1,2$ depend only on the variable y.

(4) $\mathrm{supp}(f_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)})$ is contained in $V_{\mathbf{s}}$.

(5) the amplitude $b_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)}(x,h)$ admits a classical expansion

$$b_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)} \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} h^k w_{\mathbf{s},k} \tag{3.11}$$

with

$$w_{\mathbf{s},0} = (-1)^{d-1} \frac{|\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{4}}} dy \ \text{ on } \ \{z = 0\} \tag{3.12}$$

Observe that the only minor (but important) difference with [5] is the property (2), saying that each $\chi_{m_j}, j = 1,2$ is supported in one of the two different half plane $\{y \lessgtr 0\}$. Let us now compute the first coefficient in the asymptotic expansion of $\hat{\ell}^{p,\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$. Using the above properties, Proposition 2.6 and following the computations of [5] section 6 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \langle f_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)}, d_{\phi,h} g_{\mathbf{m}}^{(0)} \rangle = \\ h^{1-\frac{d}{2}} c(\mathbf{m},h) e(\mathbf{s},h) \int_{B(\mathbf{s},\epsilon)} e^{-(\phi_+(x)+\phi(x)-\phi(\mathbf{m}))/h} (\hat{\chi}'_{\mathbf{m}}(y) + \mathcal{O}(h)) dy \wedge dz_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge dz_d \\ + \mathcal{O}_\epsilon(e^{-(\phi(\mathbf{s})-\phi(\mathbf{m})+c_\epsilon)/h})\end{aligned}$$

with

$$e(\mathbf{s},h) = \varepsilon_0 (-1)^{d-1} \frac{|\det \mathrm{Hess}\, \phi(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\pi^{\frac{d}{4}}} + \mathcal{O}(h) = \varepsilon_0 (-1)^{d-1} \pi^{-\frac{d}{4}} h_\phi(\mathbf{s}) + \mathcal{O}(h)$$

Using the local form of ϕ and ϕ_+, we get

$$\hat{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = h^{1-\frac{d}{2}} c(\mathbf{m},h) e(\mathbf{s},h) e^{-(\phi(\mathbf{s})-\phi(\mathbf{m}))/h} \int_{B(\mathbf{s},\epsilon)} e^{-g_-(z)/h} (\hat{\chi}'_{\mathbf{m}}(y) + \mathcal{O}(h)) dy \wedge dz_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge dz_d + \mathcal{O}_\epsilon\big(e^{-(\phi(\mathbf{s})-\phi(\mathbf{m})+c_\epsilon)/h}\big)$$

with $g_-(z) = \sum_{j=2}^d \hat{\lambda}_j(\mathbf{s}) z_j^2$. Since $\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}}$ depends only on y and $g_- \geq c\nu^2$ on $|z|_\infty \geq \nu$, the integration domain $B(\mathbf{s},\epsilon)$ can be replaced by a smaller one $W_{\mathbf{s}} = \{|y| < \epsilon,\ |z|_\infty \leq \nu_\epsilon$ modulo exponentially small error terms. Using also the identity $S(\mathbf{m}) = \phi(\mathbf{s}) - \phi(\mathbf{m})$, we get

$$\hat{\ell}^{\alpha}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = I_\epsilon(h) e^{-S(\mathbf{m})/h} + \mathcal{O}_\epsilon(e^{-(S(\mathbf{m})+c_\epsilon)/h})$$

with

$$I_\epsilon(h) = h^{1-\frac{d}{2}} c(\mathbf{m},h) e(\mathbf{s},h) \int_{W_{\mathbf{s}}} e^{-g_-(z)/h} (\hat{\chi}'_{\mathbf{m}}(y) + \mathcal{O}(h)) dy \wedge dz_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge dz_d$$

The integral in the right hand side can be easily computed by mean of Stoke formula and Laplace method. We get

$$\begin{aligned} I_\epsilon(h) &= h^{1-\frac{d}{2}} c(\mathbf{m},h) e(\mathbf{s},h) ([\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}}]^\epsilon_{-\epsilon} + \mathcal{O}(h)) \int_{|z|_\infty \leq \nu_\epsilon} e^{-g_-(z)/h} dz_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge dz_d \\ &= h^{\frac{1}{2}} c(\mathbf{m},h) e(\mathbf{s},h) ([\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}}]^\epsilon_{-\epsilon} + \mathcal{O}(h)) \Big(\frac{\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}{|\hat{\lambda}_2(\mathbf{s}) \ldots \hat{\lambda}_d(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \Big) \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the expression of $c(\mathbf{m},h)$ and $e(\mathbf{s},h)$, we obtain

$$\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \varepsilon_0 (-1)^{d-1} [\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}}]^\epsilon_{-\epsilon} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h_\phi(\mathbf{m})}{h_\phi(\mathbf{s})}.$$

We now remark that with our choice of $\hat{\chi}_m$, one has $[\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}_1}]^\epsilon_{-\epsilon} = -1$ and $[\hat{\chi}_{\mathbf{m}_2}]^\epsilon_{-\epsilon} = 1$. Taking $\varepsilon_0 = (-1)^d$, we get immediately the formula of $ii)$.

□

From Lemma A.2, we know that the singular values of a block-diagonal matrix are given by the singular values of each block. Hence, in view of the results of the preceding section, the proof of Theorem 1.1 reduces to the study of the matrices $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$. On the other hand, one has the partition $\underline{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}^{\leq n} \cup \mathcal{A}^{>n}$ with $\mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$ defined by (2.2) and $\mathcal{A}^{>n} = \underline{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$. Hence,

$$\mathscr{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathscr{L}^{\leq} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathscr{L}^{>} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.13}$$

with $\mathscr{L}^{\leq} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathscr{L}^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n})$ and $\mathscr{L}^{>} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathscr{L}^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{>n})$. As we shall see later, we will not prove precise asymptotic on the matrix $\mathscr{L}^{>}$ and just recall the previous result of [8]. In order to compute the singular values of $\mathscr{L}^{\leq}$, we work successively on each $\mathscr{L}^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$. The computation of the singular values of this matrix depends on the fact that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$ or $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$, where we recall that these sets were defined by (2.3).

4. Computation of singular values for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$

We have seen that given $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$ the points of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ are either all of type I, or all of type II. We then define $\mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,I} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}, \alpha \text{ is of type I}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}, \alpha \text{ is of type II}\}$. We shall now treat independently the case $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,I}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II}$. Throughout this section, we will use the following notations. Given $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2 \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$, we denote

$$\Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2) = (-1)^d \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\frac{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_1)}{h_\phi(\mathbf{s})} \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}_1} - \frac{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_2)}{h_\phi(\mathbf{s})} \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}_2} \Big) \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1) = (-1)^d \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_1)}{h_\phi(\mathbf{s})} \delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}_1}. \tag{4.2}$$

4.1. Singular values of $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ in type II case.

In this section, we compute explicitly the singular values of $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$, when α is of type II.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II}$ be fixed. The matrix $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ has exactly $q_\alpha = \sharp \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ singular values counted with multiplicity, $\lambda_{\alpha,\mu}(h)$, $\mu = 1, \dots, q_\alpha$. They have the following form*

$$\lambda_{\alpha,\mu}(h) = h^{\frac{1}{2}} b_{\alpha,\mu}(h) e^{-S_{\nu(\alpha)}/h}$$

where $\nu(\alpha)$ is defined below (2.3), $b_{\alpha,\mu} \sim \sum_{r=0}^\infty h^r b_{\alpha,\mu,r}$ is a classical symbol such that the $b_{\alpha,\mu,0}$, $\mu = 1, \dots, q_\alpha$ are the non zero singular values of the matrix $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}$ given by $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$ with $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$ defined in Lemma 2.5.

The end of the section is devoted to the proof of this theorem. First, observe that since $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II}$, then all points in $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ are of type II and hence $\sharp \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)} = q_\alpha + 1$. In the following, we denote $\hat{q}_\alpha = q_\alpha + 1$. We first compute the coefficients of $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ accurately. Recall that the matrix $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ is defined by (3.7).

Lemma 4.1. *For all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II}$, one has $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = e^{-S_{\nu(\alpha)/h}} \widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$. Moreover the leading term $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}^{,0} = (\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}})$ in the asymptotic expansion of $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ satisfies*

$$\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})), \ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. It follows from the definition that for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II}$, one has

$$\forall \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}, \ \phi(\mathbf{m}) = \phi(\mathbf{m}'). \tag{4.4}$$

and hence $S(\mathbf{m}) = S_{\nu(\alpha)}$ for any $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$. Together with the definition of $\tilde{\ell}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$, this proves that $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = e^{-S_{\nu(\alpha)/h}} \widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$. Since α is of type II, then $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$ belongs to $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$, and hence formula (4.3) follows directly from Lemma 3.4. □

Lemma 4.2. *For all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mathrm{Ker}(\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}) = \mathbb{R}\xi_0$ where $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_\alpha} \simeq \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ is defined by*

$$\xi_0(\mathbf{m}) = h_\phi(\mathbf{m})^{-1}$$

for all $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_\alpha}$ such that $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,0}}x = 0$. Let us identify $\mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_\alpha}$ with $\mathscr{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)})$ and write $x = (x_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m}\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}}$. Then the equation $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,0}}x = 0$ reads

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}} \tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} x_{\mathbf{m}} = 0,\ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}.$$

From $i)$ of Lemma 3.4 it follows that

$$\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} x_{\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} = -\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})} x_{\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})},\ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$$

and thanks to (3.10) we get

$$x_{\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) = x_{\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})} h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})),\ \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} \tag{4.5}$$

Now, we recall that for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$ are exactly the two minima such that $\mathbf{s} = \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_1) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_2)$. Therefore, we deduce from (4.5) that

$$\forall \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)},\ (\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}') \neq \varnothing \Longrightarrow h_\phi(\mathbf{m}) x_{\mathbf{m}} = h_\phi(\mathbf{m}') x_{\mathbf{m}'}).$$

Therefore $x_{\mathbf{m}} h_\phi(\mathbf{m})$ is constant on $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$, which means exactly that $x \in \mathbb{R}\xi_0$. □

Let us now prove Theorem 4.1. From Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.1, one has

$$\mathscr{L}^\alpha = \widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}\,\mathscr{T}^\alpha = e^{-S_{\nu(\alpha)}/h}\,\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}\,\mathscr{T}^\alpha$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.7, the matrix $\mathscr{T}^\alpha$ has a classical expansion $\mathscr{T}^\alpha = \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \mathscr{T}^{\alpha,k}$ whose leading term is given by

$$\mathscr{T}^{\alpha,0} = (\theta^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}'))_{\mathbf{m}',\mathbf{m}}.$$

Moreover, thanks to Lemma 2.7, the function $\theta^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{m}}$ is orthogonal to the function $\theta^{\alpha,0}_0(\nu) = \frac{c^\alpha_0(0)}{\gamma_0(\nu)}$. Since $\theta^{\alpha,0}_0$ is proportional to ξ_0, and thanks to dimension consideration, we get

$$\operatorname{Ran} \mathscr{T}^{\alpha,0} = \xi_0^\perp \tag{4.6}$$

Since $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ has also a classical expansion $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} \sim \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,k}}$, and thanks to Lemma A.3, it suffices to prove that the singular values of $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,0}}\mathscr{T}^{\alpha,0}$ are exactly the q_α non zero singular values of $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,0}}$. Observe that by construction, one has $(\mathscr{T}^\alpha)^*\mathscr{T}^\alpha = \mathrm{Id}$ and thanks to (4.6) and Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\operatorname{Ker} \widetilde{\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,0}} = (\operatorname{Ran} \mathscr{T}^{\alpha,0})^\perp.$$

Hence, we can apply Lemma A.4 which gives directly the result.

4.2. **Singular values of $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ in type I case.** In this section, we compute explicitly the singular values of $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$, when α is of type I.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,I}$. Then, there exists a partition $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} = \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{b}} \cup \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{i}}$ such that the following hold true:*

i) for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{i}}$, $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$ belong to $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$.

ii) for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),b}$ one has $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)$ and

$$\mathbf{s} \in \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)).$$

Proof. Define $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{i}} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}, \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2 \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}\}$. Then $i)$ is true by definition. Moreover, defining $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{b}} = \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} \setminus \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{i}}$, one has automatically the partition property and it remains to prove ii). For this purpose, let $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),b}$. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$. But by definition of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),\mathbf{b}}$, $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$ can not belong to $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$. Hence $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in E_-(\alpha)$ and it follows that $\mathbf{m}_2 = \hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)$. This completes the proof of ii). □

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,I}$ be fixed. The matrix $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ has exactly $q_\alpha := \sharp\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ singular values counted with multiplicity. These singular values $\lambda_{\alpha,\mu}(h)$, $\mu = 1, \dots, q_\alpha$ have the following form*

$$\lambda_{\alpha,\mu}(h) = b_{\alpha,\mu}(h) e^{-S_{\nu(\alpha)}/h}$$

where $\nu(\alpha)$ is defined below (2.3), $b_{\alpha,\mu} \sim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{r=0}^\infty h^r b_{\alpha,\mu,r}$ has a classical expansion such that $b_{\alpha,\mu,0}$ are the q_α non zero singular values of the matrix $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}$ given by

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$$

if $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{i}}$ and

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))$$

if $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{b}}$.

The proof of this result is very close to that of Theorem 4.1. We just sketch it, emphasizing the small differences due to the fact that we are here in the type I case. First, we recall that in that case the matrix $\mathscr{T}^\alpha$ is just the identity matrix and hence $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = \mathscr{L}^\alpha$. From Lemma 3.4, we know that the rescaled matrix $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = (\tilde{\ell}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$ satisfies $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = e^{S_{\nu(\alpha)/h}} \widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ and admits a classical expansion $\tilde{\ell}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} \sim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,k}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$. The coefficients $\tilde{\ell}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$ are computed by Lemma 3.4 and we have just to make the link with the partition of Lemma 4.3. If $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{i}}$, then $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and we get

i) for any $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})$, $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = 0$.
ii) $\frac{\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})}}{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))} = -\frac{\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})}}{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))}$
iii) $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} = (-1)^d \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))}{h_\phi(\mathbf{s})}$

If $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{b}}$, then the support of $f_{\mathbf{s}}^{(1)}$ meets only the support of $f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})}$ and we get

iv) for any $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})$, $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = 0$.
v) $\tilde{\ell}^{\alpha,0}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{s})} = (-1)^d \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{h_\phi(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))}{h_\phi(\mathbf{s})}$

All this proves the formula of Theorem 4.2 and it remains just to prove that the singular values of the matrix $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}$ are non vanishing. Assume that $x \in \mathbb{R}^{q_\alpha} \simeq \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)})$ satisfies $\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0} x = 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.2, one shows that there exists a constant c such that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, $h_\phi(\mathbf{m}) x_{\mathbf{m}} = c$. On the other hand, if $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1),\mathbf{b}}$, it follows from statement v) above that $x_{\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} = 0$. Combining these two informations, we get $c = 0$ which proves that $\mathrm{Ker}(\widetilde{\mathscr{L}}^{\alpha,0}) = 0$.

5. Computation of singular values for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$

In all this section we assume that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$. Then the function ϕ takes two different values on $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$: either $\phi(\mathbf{m}) = \varphi_-$ or $\phi(\mathbf{m}) = \varphi_+ > \varphi_-$. By definition, $\varphi_\pm$ satisfy $\sigma_{k(\alpha)} - S_{\nu_-(\alpha)} = \varphi_-$ and $\sigma_{k(\alpha)} - S_{\nu_+(\alpha)} = \varphi_+$. Once again, we write $\mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n} = \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,I} \cup \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,II}$ with

$$\mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,I} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n},\ \phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)) < \inf_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}} \phi(\mathbf{m})\} \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,II} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n},\ \exists \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}, \phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)) = \phi(\mathbf{m})\} \tag{5.2}$$

5.1. **Case of type II points.** In this section we assume that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,II}$. Then $\varphi_- := \phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}})$ and we have again a partition $\mathscr{P}_\alpha^{(0)}$ given by $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)} = \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)} \cup \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ with

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)},\ \phi(\mathbf{m}) = \varphi_\pm\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Observe that by definition, one has $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)} \cup \{\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)\}$ with $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(0)} := \{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)},\ \phi(\mathbf{m}) = \varphi_\pm\}$. We order the two elements of $\mathscr{P}_\alpha^{(0)}$ by deciding $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_+^{(0)} \prec \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_-^{(0)}$. Let us now deal with the saddle points and introduce the partition $\mathscr{P}_\alpha^{(1)}$:

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} = \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,-}^{(1)} \tag{5.4}$$

with $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+}^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)},\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha,-}^{(1)} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)},\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}\}$, where the functions $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2$ are defined by Lemma 2.5. Denote also $p_{\alpha,+} = \sharp\, \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+}^{(1)}$, $p_{\alpha,-} = \sharp\, \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,-}^{(1)}$ and $p_{\alpha,+-} = \sharp\, \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)}$. In the case $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)}$, it follows from the choice of Lemma 2.5 that $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}$. Let us order the partition $\mathscr{P}_\alpha^{(1)}$ by $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+}^{(1)} \prec \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)} \prec \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,-}^{(1)}$ and denote

$$\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = h^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h} \widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}_{\mathscr{P}_\alpha^{(1)}, \mathscr{P}_\alpha^{(0)}}. \tag{5.5}$$

We have the following

Lemma 5.1. *The matrix $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ has the form*

$$\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} \iota & 0 \\ b_{+-} & \tau b_{-+} \\ 0 & \tau a \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\tau = e^{(S_{\nu_+(\alpha)} - S_{\nu_-(\alpha)})/h}$ and the matrices ι, b_{+-}, b_{-+} admit a classical expansion whose principal terms are given by the following formula

- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ one has $\iota_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}^0 = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$*
- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,-}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}$ one has $a_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}^0 = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$*
- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}$ one has $(b_{+-}^0)_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))$ and $(b_{-+}^0)_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}'} = -\Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}', \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$*

with Υ_2, Υ_1 given by (4.1), (4.2).

Proof. Using Lemma 3.4, it suffices to work as in the proof of Lemma 4.1. □

In the analysis below we need to study the partial matrix defined in the preceding Lemma. For this purpose, we introduce some restricted equivalence relations as follows. Let $\mathcal{R}^+$ be the equivalence relation defined on $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+} = \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ by

$$\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}^+\mathbf{m}' \text{ iff } \exists m_1,\dots,m_K \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+},\ \begin{cases} m_1 = \mathbf{m},\ m_K = \mathbf{m}' \\ \forall k = 1,\dots,K-1,\ \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_k)\cap\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_{k+1}) \neq \varnothing \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

and the similar relation $\mathcal{R}^-$ on $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$ by

$$\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}^-\mathbf{m}' \text{ iff } \exists m_1,\dots,m_K \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-},\ \begin{cases} m_1 = \mathbf{m},\ m_K = \mathbf{m}' \\ \forall k = 1,\dots,K-1,\ \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_k)\cap\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_{k+1}) \neq \varnothing \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

We shall denote by $\mathrm{Cl}^+(\mathbf{m})$, $\mathrm{Cl}^-(\mathbf{m})$ the associated equivalence classes of any element $\mathbf{m}$. In the following, we denote $\hat{q}_{\alpha,\pm} = \sharp\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,\pm}$ and we shall say that $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,+}}$ (resp. $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,-}}$) is subordinate to $\mathcal{R}^+$ (resp. to $\mathcal{R}^-$) if

$$\forall \mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+},\ \Big(\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}^+\mathbf{m}' \Longrightarrow x_{\mathbf{m}} = x_{\mathbf{m}'}\Big).$$

(resp. $\mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}^-\mathbf{m}' \Longrightarrow x_{\mathbf{m}} = x_{\mathbf{m}'}$.) Throughout this section, we write $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,\pm}}$ as $x = (x_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m}\in\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,\pm}}$, and we define $j^\pm_\phi : \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,\pm}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,\pm}}$ by

$$(j^\pm_\phi x)_{\mathbf{m}} = h_\phi(\mathbf{m}) x_{\mathbf{m}}. \tag{5.8}$$

Lemma 5.2. *One has the following properties:*

i) $\ker(\iota^0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,+}},\ j^+_\phi x \text{ is subordinate to } \mathcal{R}^+\}$

ii) $\ker(a^0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,-}},\ j^-_\phi x \text{ is subordinate to } \mathcal{R}^-\}$

iii) Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,+}}$, *then* $x \in \ker(b_{+-})$ *iff for all* $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$, *one has*

$$\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-} \neq \varnothing \Longrightarrow x_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$$

iv) Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,-}}$, *then* $x \in \ker(b_{-+})$ *iff for all* $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$, *one has*

$$\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-} \neq \varnothing \Longrightarrow x_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$$

Proof. The points i) and ii) are proved by the same argument as the one used in the proof of Lemma 4.2. The proof of iii) and iv) follows directly from the expression of b_{+-} and b_{-+} in Lemma 5.1. □

Remark 5.3. *At this stage of our analysis, one could proceed as in* [8] *and write* $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = \mathcal{R}^\alpha\mathcal{B}^\alpha\mathcal{T}^\alpha$ *with*

$$\mathcal{R}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \iota & 0 \\ b_{+-} & b_{-+} \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix},\quad \mathcal{B}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}^+_\alpha}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau\,\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}^-_\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathscr{T}^\alpha$ given by (5.11) *below. Then, an immediate computation shows that $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = \mathcal{R}^\alpha \mathscr{T}^\alpha \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\alpha$ with*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}^+_\alpha}} & 0 \\ 0 & \tau\,\mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{q^-_\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Moreover, one can see that the matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}^\alpha := \mathcal{R}^\alpha \mathscr{T}^\alpha$ is injective. Suppose indeed that $y = (y_+, y_-) = \mathscr{T}^\alpha x \in \ker \mathcal{R}^\alpha$. It follows from Lemma 5.2 that $j^+_\phi y_+$ is subordinate to $\mathcal{R}^+$ and $j^-_\phi y_-$ is subordinate to $\mathcal{R}^-$. Since $y_- \in \operatorname{Ran} \mathscr{T}^\alpha_-$, this implies $y_- = 0$, and combined with the equation $b_{+-}y_+ + b_{-+}y_- = 0$ this shows that $y = 0$ (see the argument throughout the section for more detailed similar reasoning). This shows that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}^\alpha$ is injective and reasoning as in [8]*, this implies that the singular values of $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ are either of order* 1 *or of order τ.*

It turns out that the above proof can be easily generalized to the case where ϕ may take an arbitrary amount of values on $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$ (that is we do not need assumption H(2,n)). This permits to recover the result of [8] *Theorem 7.1.*

We return now to the study of $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$. By a standard block-matrix computation one has

$$(\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha})^* \widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} J & \tau\widehat{B} \\ \tau\widehat{B}^* & \tau^2 \widehat{A} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.9}$$

with $J = \iota^*\iota + b^*_{+-}b_{+-}$, $\widehat{B} = b^*_{+-}b_{-+}$ and $\widehat{A} = a^*a + b^*_{-+}b_{-+}$. All these matrices admit a classical expansion, $\widehat{A} \simeq \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \widehat{A}^k$, $\widehat{B} \simeq \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \widehat{B}^k$, $J = \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k J^k$ and one has $J^0 = (\iota^0)^*\iota^0 + (b^0_{+-})^* b^0_{+-}$, $\widehat{B}^0 = (b^0_{+-})^* b^0_{-+}$ and $\widehat{A}^0 = (a^0)^* a + (b^0_{-+})^* b_{-+}$ On the other hand, one has by definition

$$\mathscr{L}^\alpha = h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h} \widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} \mathscr{T}^\alpha$$

and hence

$$(\mathscr{L}^\alpha)^* \mathscr{L}^\alpha = h e^{-2S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h} (\mathscr{T}^\alpha)^* (\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha})^* \widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha} \mathscr{T}^\alpha. \tag{5.10}$$

Moreover, since for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ one has $\phi(\hat{\mathbf{m}}(\alpha)) = \phi(\mathbf{m}) < \phi(\mathbf{m}')$, then all the points of $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$ are of type II whereas all the points of $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ are of type I. Therefore, in a basis adapted to the partition one has

$$\mathscr{T}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} I_{q_{\alpha,+}} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathscr{T}^\alpha_- \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.11}$$

where

- $\mathscr{T}^\alpha_-$ is a $(q_{\alpha,-}+1) \times q_{\alpha,-}$ matrix (with $q_{\alpha,-} = \sharp \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$) whose column vector form an orthonormal basis of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{q_{\alpha,-}+1},\ x \perp \xi^-_0\}$ with $\xi^-_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,-}}$ defined by $\xi^-_0(\mathbf{m}) = h_\phi(\mathbf{m})^{-1}$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$.
- $I_{q_{\alpha,+}}$ is the $q_{\alpha,+} \times q_{\alpha,+}$ identity matrix (with $q_{\alpha,+} = \sharp \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$).

It follows from (5.9), (5.10) and (5.11) that

$$(\mathscr{L}^\alpha)^* \mathscr{L}^\alpha = h e^{-2S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h} \begin{pmatrix} J & \tau B \\ \tau B^* & \tau^2 A \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.12}$$

with $B = \widehat{B}\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha$, and $A = (\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha)^*\widehat{A}\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha$. Our aim is to apply Lemma A.6 to the matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} J & \tau B \\ \tau B^* & \tau^2 A \end{pmatrix}.$$

For this purpose, we have to show that J and $A - B^*J^{-1}B$ are symmetric positive definite. Observe first that these matrices are symmetric by construction. Moreover, since all these matrices have classical expansion, it is sufficient to prove that the dominant terms J^0 and $A^0 - (B^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}B^0$ are positive definite.

Since $J^0 = \iota^{0,*}\iota^0 + b_{+-}^{0,*}b_{+-}^0$, it is clearly a positive matrix. Let us show that its kernel is trivial. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.2 and we just sketch it. Suppose that $x \in \mathbb{R}^{q_{\alpha,+}}$ satisfies $(\iota^{0,*}\iota^0 + b_{+-}^{0,*}b_{+-}^0)x = 0$. Then one has $\iota^0 x = 0$ and $b_{+-}^0 x = 0$. From i) and iii) of Lemma 5.2, it follows that $j_\phi^+ x$ is subordinate to $\mathcal{R}^+$, that is $(j_\phi^+ x)_{\mathbf{m}}$ depends only on $\mathrm{Cl}^+(\mathbf{m})$, and $x_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ such that $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)} \neq \varnothing$. On the other hand, we claim that

$$\forall \omega \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}/\mathcal{R}^+,\ \exists \mathbf{m} \in \omega,\ \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)} \neq \varnothing. \tag{5.13}$$

Assuming that this property holds true, and using the fact that j_ϕ^+ is invertible, it follows that $x_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$.

Let us now prove (5.13). By definition of $\mathcal{A}_+^{\leq n}$, $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}$ is strictly contained in $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and hence there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}$. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}/\mathcal{R}^+$ and $\mathbf{m}_1 \in \omega$. Since $\mathbf{m}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, one has $\mathbf{m}_1 \mathcal{R} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}$. Hence there exists $\mathbf{m}_2, \dots, \mathbf{m}_K \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ such that $\mathbf{m}_K = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ and for all $k = 1, \dots K-1$, $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_k) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_{k+1}) \neq \varnothing$. Denoting

$$k_0 = \sup\{k,\ \mathbf{m}_k \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)}\}$$

we have $k_0 < K$ since $\tilde{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}$ and then $\mathbf{s} = \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_{k_0}) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_{k_0+1}) \in \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,+-}^{(1)}$. Therefore $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_{k_0}$ has the required property. The proof that J^0 is positive definite is complete.

Let us now study the matrix $\Delta^0 := A^0 - B^{0,*}(J^0)^{-1}B^0$ which is well-defined since J^0 is invertible. Let us show that it is positive definite. One has

$$\Delta^0 = (\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha)^*\widehat{A}^0\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha - (\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha)^*(\widehat{B}^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}\widehat{B}^0\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha = (\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha)^*\widehat{\Delta}^0\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha$$

with $\widehat{\Delta}^0 = \widehat{A}^0 - (\widehat{B}^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}\widehat{B}^0$. In order to prove that Δ^0 is positive it suffices then to show that so is $\widehat{\Delta}^0$. From the definitions, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Delta}^0 &= a^{0,*}a^0 + b_{-+}^{0,*}b_{-+}^0 - b_{-+}^{0,*}b_{+-}^0(J^0)^{-1}b_{+-}^{0,*}b_{-+}^0 \\ &= a^{0,*}a^0 + b_{-+}^{0,*}\big(\mathrm{Id} - b_{+-}^0(J^0)^{-1}b_{+-}^{0,*}\big)b_{-+}^0\end{aligned}$$

and hence, it is sufficient to show that $\mathrm{Id} - b_{+-}^0(J^0)^{-1}b_{+-}^{0,*}$ is positive. For this purpose it is enough to prove that the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix $F := b_{+-}^0(J^0)^{-1}b_{+-}^{0,*}$ are bounded from above by 1. Let us write $F = GG^*$ with $G = b_{+-}^0(J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the eigenvalues

(with multiplicity) of F are the same as that of $H := G^*G$. On the other hand, one has

$$\begin{aligned} H &= (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^{0,*}_{+-} b^0_{+-} (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (\iota^{0,*}\iota^0 + b^{0,*}_{+-} b^0_{+-})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^{0,*}_{+-} b^0_{+-} (\iota^{0,*}\iota^0 + b^{0,*}_{+-} b^0_{+-})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \mathrm{Id} - (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \iota^{0,*}\iota^0 (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Since the second term in the right hand side above is non-negative, it follows that $H \leq \mathrm{Id}$ which proves that the eigenvalues of H are smaller than 1 and hence $\widehat{\Delta}^0$ is positive and so is Δ^0. Let us now prove that $\ker \Delta^0 = 0$. Suppose that $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{q}_{\alpha,-}}$ satisfies $\Delta^0 x = 0$. Then $y = \mathscr{T}_-^{\alpha} x$ is non zero and satisfies

$$a^{0,*}a^0 y + b^{0,*}_{-+}\big(\mathrm{Id} - b^0_{+-}(J^0)^{-1} b^{0,*}_{+-}\big) b^0_{-+} y = 0$$

and hence

$$a^0 y = 0, \ \ \big(\mathrm{Id} - b^0_{+-}(J^0)^{-1} b^{0,*}_{+-}\big) b^0_{-+} y = 0$$

From $a^0 y = 0$ and ii) of Lemma 5.2, one deduces that $\tilde{y} := j^-_\phi y$ is subordinate to $\mathcal{R}^-$, that is $\tilde{y}_{\mathbf{m}}$ depends only on $\mathrm{Cl}^-(\mathbf{m})$. Let us now prove that $\tilde{y}_{\mathbf{m}}$ is independent of $\mathbf{m}$. For this purpose we use the second equation above. Let $z = b^0_{-+} y$, then

$$b^0_{+-}(J^0)^{-1} b^{0,*}_{+-} z = z \tag{5.14}$$

and denoting $F = (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^{0,*}_{+-}$ we get $F^*Fz = z$. If $z = 0$, then $y \in \ker b^0_{-+}$ and it follows from iv) of Lemma 5.2 that $y_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{m}$ such that $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-} \neq \varnothing$. On the other hand, one shows as before that

$$\forall \omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}/\mathcal{R}^-, \ \exists \mathbf{m} \in \omega, \ \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-} \neq \varnothing.$$

This proves that $y = 0$.

Suppose now that $z \neq 0$, then $Fz \neq 0$ and one has $FF^*Fz = Fz$. Since $F = (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^{0,*}_{+-}$ and $J^0 = \iota^{0,*}\iota^0 + b^{0,*}_{+-} b^0_{+-}$, one has

$$FF^* = (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^{0,*}_{+-} b^0_{+-} (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} J^0 (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \iota^{0,*}\iota^0 (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It follows that

$$(J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \iota^{0,*}\iota^0 (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} Fz = 0.$$

that is $\iota^0 (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} Fz = 0$. Since $F = (J^0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^{0,*}_{+-}$ we get $(J^0)^{-1} b^{0,*}_{+-} z \in \ker \iota^0$. Combined with (5.14), this shows that $z = b^0_{+-} u$ with $u \in \ker(\iota^0)$. Using Lemma 5.1, it follows that

$$z_{\mathbf{s}} = -k_\phi(\mathbf{s}) (j^+_\phi u)_{\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})} \tag{5.15}$$

with $k_\phi(\mathbf{s}) := (-1)^d \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\mathbf{s})|^{\frac{1}{2}} h_\phi(\mathbf{s})^{-1}$. On the other hand, since $z_{\mathbf{s}} = b^0_{-+} y$, Lemma 5.1 yields also

$$z_{\mathbf{s}} = k_\phi(\mathbf{s}) (j^-_\phi y)_{\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})}. \tag{5.16}$$

Combining these two identities with i) of Lemma 5.2 it follows that

$$\forall \mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}^+\mathbf{m}', \Big(\mathbf{s} \in \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}), \mathbf{s}' \in \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}') \Longrightarrow (j^-_\phi y)_{\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})} = (j^-_\phi y)_{\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}')}\Big). \tag{5.17}$$

Denote now $\omega^-_1, \ldots, \omega^-_r \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}/\mathcal{R}^-$ the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{R}^-$. We have seen that $\tilde{y}_{\mathbf{m}} = (j^-_\phi y)_{\mathbf{m}}$ depends only of the ω^-_j that contains $\mathbf{m}$. We shall now prove by induction on r that

all these values are equal. For this purpose, let $\mathbf{m}_- \in \omega_1^-$ be such that $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_-) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-} \neq \varnothing$. There exists $\mathbf{m}_+ \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ such that $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_-) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_+) \neq \varnothing$. Hence the set

$$\mathcal{E} = \{\omega^+ \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}/\mathcal{R}^+,\ \Gamma_\alpha(\omega^+) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\omega_1^-) \neq \varnothing\}$$

is non empty (here we denote $\Gamma_\alpha(\omega^+) = \cup_{\mathbf{m}\in\omega^+}\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m})$). Moreover, there exists $j \neq 1$ and $\omega_1^+ \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\Gamma_\alpha(\omega_1^+) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\omega_j^-) \neq \varnothing$ (otherwise ω_1^- and ω_j^-, $j \neq 1$ would belong to different equivalence classes of $\mathcal{R}$). Combined with (5.17), this shows that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \omega_1^-$ and all $\mathbf{m}' \in \omega_j^-$, one has $\tilde{y}_\mathbf{m} = \tilde{y}_{\mathbf{m}'}$. By induction, it follows that $\tilde{y}_\mathbf{m}$ is constant.

Going back to the definition, it follows that y is proportional to ξ_0^-. But since $y \in \mathrm{Ran}\,\mathscr{T}_\alpha^-$, then $y \perp \xi_0^-$ and hence $y = 0$. This completes the proof that Δ^0 is positive definite.

Thanks to the preceding analysis, we can apply Lemma A.6 with $\epsilon = \tau = e^{(S_{\nu_+(\alpha)} - S_{\nu_-(\alpha)})/h}$. It follows that $\mathcal{M}_\tau$ has exactly $q_{\alpha,+}$ eigenvalues of order 1 which satisfy

$$\sigma_\ell(\mathcal{M}_\tau) = \sigma(J) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2).$$

It has also $q_{\alpha,-}$ eigenvalues of order τ^2 which are given by

$$\sigma_s(\mathcal{M}_\tau) = \tau^2\sigma(A - B^* J^{-1} B) + \mathcal{O}(\tau^4)$$

Thanks to (5.12), this proves that $(\mathscr{L}^\alpha)^*\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ admits exactly $q_{\alpha,+}$ eigenvalues of order $he^{-2S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h}$ and $q_{\alpha,+}$ eigenvalues of order $he^{-2S_{\nu_-(\alpha)}/h}$. These eigenvalues $z_1^\pm, \dots, z^\pm_{q_{\alpha,\pm}}$ satisfy

$$z_q^\pm(h) = he^{-2S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}/h}(\eta^\pm_{\alpha,q}(h) + \mathcal{O}(e^{2(S_{\nu_+(\alpha)} - S_{\nu_-(\alpha)})/h}))$$

where $\eta^+_{\alpha,q}(h)$ are the eigenvalues of J and $\eta^-_{\alpha,q}(h)$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix $A - B^*J^{-1}B$. Moreover, these latter matrices are symmetric definite positive and admits a classical expansion. Hence, the $\eta^\pm_{\alpha,q}(h)$ admit also a classical expansion

$$\eta_{\alpha,q}(h) \sim \sum_{k=0}^\infty \eta^{\pm,k}_{\alpha,q} h^k$$

and the leading coefficients $\eta^{+,0}_{\alpha,q}$, $\eta^{-,0}_{\alpha,q}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrices J^0 and $\Delta_0 = A^0 - (B^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}B^0$ respectively. Eventually, one has seen that $\Delta_0 = (\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha)^*\widehat{\Delta}_0\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha$ with $\mathrm{Ker}\,\widehat{\Delta}_0 \subset \mathrm{Ran}(\mathscr{T}_-^\alpha)^\perp$. Hence, Corollary A.5 applies and shows that $\sigma(\Delta_0)$ is exactly the set of non zero eigenvalues of $\widehat{\Delta}_0$. Summing up the above discussion, we have proved the following

Theorem 5.1. *Assume H(2,n) and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,II}$. The matrix $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ has exactly $q_{\alpha,\pm} = \sharp\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,\pm}$ singular values $\lambda^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}(h)$, $\mu = 1, \dots, q_{\alpha,\pm}$ counted with multiplicity which are equivalent to $h^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}/h}$. These singular values have the following form*

$$\lambda^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}(h) = b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}(h)e^{-S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}/h}$$

where $b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu} \sim h^{\frac{1}{2}}\sum_k h^k b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu,k}$ is a classical symbol such that $(b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu,0})^2$ are the $q_{\alpha,\pm}$ non-zero eigenvalues of the matrices $G^\pm$ given by $G^+ = J^0$ and $G^- = \widehat{A}^0 - (\widehat{B}^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}\widehat{B}^0$, where $\widehat{A}^0, J^0$ and $\widehat{B}^0$ are defined below (5.9).

Let us make a few comments on this theorem. First, observe that the pre-factor $b^\pm = b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}$ obeys two different laws wether we are in the + or − case. In the + case, b^+ is determined by the matrix J^0 which depends only on the minima $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$ such that $S(\mathbf{m}) = S_{\nu_+}$. In that sense, the behavior of b^+ obeys law similar to that of Theorem 4.1. In the − case, the situation is different since the matrix G^- involves values of ϕ on all minima and not only those for which $S(\mathbf{m}) = S_{\nu_-}$. Hence the term $(\widehat{B}^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}\widehat{B}^0$ in the definition of G^- can be understood as a tunneling term between minima associate to both heights.

Finally, let us observe that it would be natural to generalize this theorem to the case where the number of different heights is not necessarily bounded by two. Such an analysis needs to look carefully at the interaction between the minima associated to an arbitrary number of heights. We give some indication on how things should work in section 5.4 below.

5.2. **Case of type I points.** In this section we assume that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,I} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}, \alpha \text{ is of type } I\}$ and we introduce the partition $\mathscr{P}^{(0)}_\alpha$ given by $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha = \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-} \cup \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ with

$$\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,\pm} = \{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha,\ \phi(\mathbf{m}) = \varphi_\pm\}.$$

We order the two elements of $\mathscr{P}^{(0)}_\alpha$ by deciding $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_+ \prec \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_-$. In order to deal with the saddle points, we introduce the partition $\mathscr{P}^{(1)}_\alpha$ which is a mix of partitions used in section 4.2 and 5.2 respectively:

$$\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha = \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,b} \cup \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,i} \cup \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-} \cup \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,-,b} \cup \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,-,i}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,-} &= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}, \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}\} \\
\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,i} &= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}\} \\
\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,b} &= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}, \phi(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})) < \varphi_-\} \\
\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,-,i} &= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}\} \\
\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,-,b} &= \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}, \phi(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s})) < \varphi_-\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

Here the function $\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2$ are defined by Lemma 2.5. In the case where $\phi(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) \neq \phi(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$, it follows from the convention of Lemma 2.5 that $\phi(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) > \phi(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$. Working as in the preceding section, one proves the following

Theorem 5.2. *Assume H(2,n) and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,I}$. The matrix $\mathscr{L}^\alpha$ has exactly $q_{\alpha,\pm} = \sharp\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,\pm}$ singular values $\lambda^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}(h)$, $\mu = 1, \dots, q_{\alpha,\pm}$ counted with multiplicity which are equivalent to $h^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}/h}$. These singular values have the following form*

$$\lambda^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}(h) = b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu}(h)e^{-S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}/h}$$

where $b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu} \sim h^{\frac{1}{2}}\sum_k h^k b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu,k}$ is a classical symbol such that $(b^\pm_{\alpha,\mu,0})^2$ are the $q_{\alpha,\pm}$ non-zero eigenvalues of the matrices $G^\pm$ given by $G^+ = J^0$ and $G^- = A^0 - (B^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}B^0$, where

A^0, B^0 and J^0 are defined by

$$J^0 = (\iota^0)^*\iota^0 + (b^0_{+-})^* b^0_{+-},\ B^0 = (b^0_{+-})^* b^0_{-+},\ A^0 = (a^0)^* a + (b^0_{-+})^* b_{-+}$$

with the matrix, a^0, b^0_{+-}, b^0_{-+} and ι^0 defined by

- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,i}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ one has $\iota^0_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$*
- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+,b}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ one has $\iota^0_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))$*
- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,-,i}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$ one has $a^0_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_2(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$*
- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,-,b}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$ one has $a^0_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))$*
- *for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,+-}$, $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,+}$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,-}$ one has $(b^0_{+-})_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}))$ and $(b^0_{-+})_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}'} = -\Upsilon_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{m}', \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$*

Proof. It is similar to the type II case. We leave it to the reader. □

5.3. **Last arguments of the proof.** In this section we explain how one can deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorems 4.1,4.2, 5.1 and 5.2. The general idea is to compare the singular values of the successive reduced matrix by mean of Fan inequalities. As a preparation, we shall compare the matrices $\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,'}$ defined in section 3. In the following, we denote $\mathcal{U}^{(0),\leq} = \cup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}^{\leq n}}\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{U}^{(0),>} = \cup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}^{>n}}\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_\alpha$, where we recall that $\mathcal{A}^{>n} = \underline{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$. We use the similar notation for $\mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. One has obviously the partitions $\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}^{(0),\leq} \cup \mathcal{U}^{(0),>}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} = \mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq} \cup \mathcal{V}^{(1),>}$ and hence

$$\mathscr{F}(\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}) = \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>})$$

and

$$\mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1)}) = \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),>}).$$

First, observe that thanks to (3.13), one has

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,'} = \mathscr{J}\,\mathcal{L}^{bkw,''} = \mathscr{J}\,\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{J}\,\Omega\mathscr{D} \tag{5.19}$$

with

- $\mathscr{D} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>})$ defined by

$$\mathscr{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathscr{D}^{n,\leq} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathscr{D}^{n,>} \end{pmatrix}$$

  with $\mathscr{D}^{n,\leq} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathscr{L}^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n})$ and $\mathscr{D}^{n,>} = \mathrm{diag}(e^{-S(\mathbf{m})/h}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0),>})$
- $\Omega : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),>})$ defined by

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & \Omega^> \end{pmatrix}$$

  with $\Omega^>_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = e^{S(\mathbf{m})/h}\mathscr{L}^\alpha_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}}$.
- $\mathscr{J} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ defined by $\mathscr{J}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}'} = \delta_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}'}$.

Observe that thanks to Lemma 3.4, one has $\Omega^{>} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Moreover, it follows from the proof of Theorem 7.1 in [8] (or from Remark 5.3) that the matrix $\Omega^{>}$ above has a left inverse $\Omega^{>,\dagger}$ and that $\Omega^{>,\dagger} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. As an immediate consequence, Ω has also a bounded left inverse $\Omega^{\dagger}$. Eventually, let us introduce the orthogonal projection operators

$$P^{\leq} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$P^{>} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),>}) \tag{5.21}$$

Lemma 5.4. *There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime} = (\mathscr{J} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))\Omega\mathscr{D}.$$

Proof. First observe that thanks to (5.19) and Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime} = \mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime} + \mathcal{R} = \mathscr{J}\Omega\mathscr{D} + \mathcal{R} \tag{5.22}$$

with $\mathcal{R} : \mathscr{F}(\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S(\mathbf{m})+\gamma)/h}),\ \forall \mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)} \tag{5.23}$$

for some $\gamma > 0$. Hence, we have to prove that there exists $\overline{\mathcal{R}} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ such that $\mathcal{R} = \overline{\mathcal{R}}\Omega\mathscr{D}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})$. Since $\Omega^{\dagger}$ is bounded, it is sufficient to find $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \oplus \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ such that

$$\mathcal{R} = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}\mathscr{D} \tag{5.24}$$

and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})$, and take $\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}\Omega^{\dagger}$. Let us decompose the matrices $\mathcal{R}, \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ into two blocks $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{R}^{\leq}\mathcal{R}^{>})$ with $\mathcal{R}^{\leq} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),\leq}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ and $\mathcal{R}^{>} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = (\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq}\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{>})$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1),\leq}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{>} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0),>}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$. Then the equation $\mathcal{R} = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}\mathscr{D}$ is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{R}^{\leq} = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq}\mathscr{D}^{n,\leq} \text{ and } \mathcal{R}^{>} = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{>}\mathscr{D}^{n,>}. \tag{5.25}$$

By definition, $\mathscr{D}^{n,>}$ is invertible and its inverse $\mathscr{D}^{n,>,-1}$ satisfies $\mathscr{D}^{n,>,-1}_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{m}} = \mathcal{O}(e^{S(\mathbf{m})/h})$. Hence $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{>} := \mathcal{R}^{>}\mathscr{D}^{n,>,-1}$ solves the second equation of (5.25) and thanks to (5.23) one has also $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{>} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})$. It remains to solve the first equation of (5.25). For this purpose, we first observe that $\mathscr{K}^{n,\leq} := (\mathscr{D}^{n,\leq})^{*}\mathscr{D}^{n,\leq}$ is invertible. Indeed, thanks to the definitions, we have

$$\mathscr{K}^{n,\leq} = \mathrm{diag}((\mathscr{L}^{\alpha})^{*}\mathscr{L}^{\alpha}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n})$$

and for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$, $\mathcal{K}^{\alpha} := (\mathscr{L}^{\alpha})^{*}\mathscr{L}^{\alpha}$ is invertible thanks to Theorems 4.1,4.2, 5.1 and 5.2. Consequently, $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq} := \mathcal{R}^{\leq}(\mathscr{K}^{n,\leq})^{-1}(\mathscr{D}^{n,\leq})^{*}$ is well-defined and solves the first equation of (5.25). It remains to prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})$. Let us write column-wise $\mathcal{R}^{\leq} = (\mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha})_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}^{\leq n}}$ with $\mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq} = (\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq,\alpha})_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}^{\leq n}}$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq,\alpha} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$. From the above definitions, one has

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq,\alpha} = \mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha}(\mathcal{K}^{\alpha})^{-1}(\mathscr{L}^{\alpha})^{*} \tag{5.26}$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$. Suppose first that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$. It follows from the results of section 4, that $(\mathscr{L}^\alpha)^* = \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_{\nu(\alpha)}/h})$ and $(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(e^{2S_{\nu(\alpha)}/h})$. Moreover, combining (5.23) with the fact that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$, $S(\mathbf{m}) = S_{\nu(\alpha)}$, one gets $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\leq,\alpha} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})$ which is the desired result.

Suppose now that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n}$ and recall the partition of section 5.1, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)} = \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,+}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,-}^{(0)}$ with $S(\mathbf{m}) = S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(0)}$. Then, we can write

$$\mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha} = (\mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha,+}\ \mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha,-})$$

with $\mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha,\pm} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(0)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}^{(1)})$. The estimate (5.23) becomes

$$\mathcal{R}^{\leq,\alpha,+} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-(S_{\nu_\pm}(\alpha)+\gamma)/h}). \tag{5.27}$$

On the other hand, it follows from the results of section 5 that $\mathscr{L}^\alpha = (\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,+}\ \mathscr{L}^{\alpha,-})$ with $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\pm} : \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(0)}) \to \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)})$ such that $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha,\pm} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_{\nu_\pm(\alpha)}/h})$. Therefore

$$(\mathscr{L}^\alpha)^* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h}) \\ \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_{\nu_-(\alpha)}/h}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.28}$$

Eventually, it follows from (5.12) and (A.4) that

$$(\mathcal{K}^\alpha)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(e^{2S_{\nu_+(\alpha)}/h}) & \mathcal{O}(e^{(S_{\nu_-(\alpha)}+S_{\nu_+(\alpha)})/h}) \\ \mathcal{O}(e^{(S_{\nu_-(\alpha)}+S_{\nu_+(\alpha)})/h}) & \mathcal{O}(e^{2S_{\nu_-(\alpha)}/h}) \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.29}$$

Combining (5.26), (5.27), (5.28) and (5.29) we obtain the desired estimate. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1. Until the end of this section, $\gamma, C > 0$ denote some constant that may change from line to line. We shall also denote by $\mu_n(M)$ the singular values of any matrix M.

From the discussion at the end of section 1, we know that the n_0 exponentially small eigenvalues of $\Delta_\phi^{(0)}$ are the square of the singular values of the matrix $\mathcal{L}$. Thanks to Lemma 2.13 and 2.14, one has

$$\mathcal{L} = (\mathrm{Id} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))\mathcal{L}^\pi(\mathrm{Id} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))$$

and it follows from Fan inequality (Lemma A.1) that

$$\mu_k(\mathcal{L}^\pi)(1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})) \leq \mu_k(\mathcal{L}) \leq \mu_k(\mathcal{L}^\pi)(1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))$$

for any $k = 1, \ldots, n_0$. Since the first column of $\mathcal{L}^\pi$ is the null vector, it follows that the non zero singular values of $\mathcal{L}^\pi$ are the singular values of $\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}$. Combining Lemma 5.4, Fan inequality and the fact that $\|\mathcal{J}\| = 1$, one gets

$$\mu_k(\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}) \leq (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))\mu_k(\Omega\mathscr{D}),\ \forall k = 1, \ldots n_0.$$

Denoting $n_0^\leq = \sharp\mathcal{U}^{(0),\leq}$, and observing that

$$\Omega\mathscr{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathscr{D}^{n,\leq} & 0 \\ 0 & \Omega^> \mathscr{D}^{n,>} \end{pmatrix}$$

we get

$$\mu_k(\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}) \leq (1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))\mu_k(\mathscr{D}^{n,\leq}),\ \forall k = 1, \ldots n_0^\leq \tag{5.30}$$

and

$$\mu_k(\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'}) \leq (1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))\|\Omega^{>}\|\mu_k(\mathscr{D}^{n,>}) \leq C\mu_k(\mathscr{D}^{n,>}),\ \forall k = n_0^{\leqslant}+1,\dots,n_0 \tag{5.31}$$

Moreover, since $\mathcal{J}^*\mathcal{J} = \mathrm{Id}$, one deduces from Lemma 5.4 that

$$\mathscr{D} = \Omega^{\dagger}(\mathrm{Id}+\mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})\mathcal{J}^*\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'} = \begin{pmatrix} P^{\leqslant}(\mathrm{Id}+\mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})\mathscr{J}^*\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'} \\ \Omega^{>,\dagger}P^{>}(\mathrm{Id}+\mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h})\mathscr{J}^*\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.32}$$

with $P^{\leqslant}, P^{<}$ defined by (5.20) and (5.21). Observe that since $P^{\leqslant}, P^{>}$ are othogonal projections, one has $\|P^{\leqslant}\|, \|P^{>}\| \leq 1$. Hence, combining (5.32) and Fan inequalities, we get

$$\mu_k(\mathscr{D}) \leq (1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-\gamma/h}))\mu_k(\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'}),\ \forall k = 1,\dots n_0^{\leqslant} \tag{5.33}$$

and

$$\mu_k(\mathscr{D}) \leq C\mu_k(\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'}),\ \forall k = n_0^{\leqslant}+1,\dots,n_0 \tag{5.34}$$

Combining estimates (5.30), (5.31), (5.33), (5.34), one sees that the $n_0^{\leqslant}$ first singular values of $\mathscr{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'}$ are equal up to multiplicative exponential factor and that the other singular values of $\mathcal{L}^{\pi,'}$ are bounded from below by $Ce^{-2S_n/h}$. Hence, it remains to identify the $n_0^{\leqslant}$ first singular values of $\mathscr{D}$. Using (3.5) and Lemma A.2 these are in fact the reunion of the singular values of the $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$. Moreover, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$, Theorems 4.1,4.2, 5.1 and 5.2 show that the singular values of $\mathscr{L}^{\alpha}$ have the form announced in Theorem 1.1. This completes the proof.

5.4. **Towards the general case.** In this section, we give some indication on how one could get rid of assumption H(2,n) and describe the low lying eigenvalues of Δ_ϕ without topological assumption. However, an argument is missing in pour approach and the present section doesn't contain a complete proof.

The idea, is to generalize the strategy of sections 5.1 and 5.2 to the case where ϕ can take $n_\alpha \geq 3$ different values on $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$. Let us give some details in the case where $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ contains a point of type II. Suppose that ϕ takes $n_\alpha \geq 3$ different values on $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$ and denote $\varphi_1 < \varphi_2 < \ldots < \varphi_{n_\alpha}$ these values. Then, there exists $p_1 < \ldots < p_{n_\alpha}$ such that

$$S(\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}) = \{S_{p_1} > \ldots > S_{p_{n_\alpha}}\}$$

with $S_{p_n} = \sigma(\alpha) - \varphi_n$. This induces a natural partition

$$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{n_\alpha} \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,n}^{(0)}$$

with $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,n}^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}, \phi(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\alpha) - S_{p_n}\}$. We order this partition by deciding that $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,n+1}^{(0)} \prec \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,n}^{(0)}$. To this partition of minima, we can associate a partition of saddle points in the following way. First recall that for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$ there exists exactly two minima $\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}), \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$ such that $\mathbf{s} = \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) \cap \Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$. Moreover, one has $S(\mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s})) \leq S(\mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}))$. Then, we get the partition of $\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$:

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)} = \bigcup_{1\leq i\leq j\leq n_\alpha} \mathcal{V}_{\alpha,i,j}^{(1)}$$

with $\mathcal{V}^{(1)}_{\alpha,i,j} = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}_\alpha,\ \mathbf{m}_1(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,i},\ \mathbf{m}_2(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}_{\alpha,j}\}$.

Using the above partitions, we can compute the matrix $\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ as in section 4. Then, the matrix $\mathcal{M}_1 := h^{-1}e^{2S_{p_1}/h}(\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha})^*\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$ has a particular structure. More precisely, this matrix can be seen as a symmetric linear map acting on the space $E_\alpha = \mathscr{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_\alpha)$. This space can be decomposed as $E_\alpha = \oplus_{n=1}^{n_\alpha} E_{\alpha,n}$ with $E_{\alpha,n} = \mathscr{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}_{\alpha,n})$. On the other hand, one can introduce the parameter $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n_\alpha - 1})$ with $0 < \tau_n = e^{(S_{p_n} - S_{p_{n+1}})/h} << 1$. Then, the matrix $\mathcal{M}_1$ is τ-graded, which means by definition that it has the form

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} J_1 & \tau_1 B_1(\tau')^* \\ \tau_1 B_1(\tau') & \tau_1^2 \mathcal{M}_2(\tau') \end{pmatrix}$$

where $J_1 : E_{\alpha,1} \to E_{\alpha,1}$ is symmetric positive definite, $B_1(\tau') : E_{\alpha,1} \to \oplus_{n=2}^{n_\alpha} E_{\alpha,n}$ has the form

$$B_1(\tau') = \begin{pmatrix} b_{1,2} \\ \tau_2 b_{1,3} \\ \vdots \\ \tau_2 \dots \tau_{n_\alpha - 1} b_{1,n_\alpha} \end{pmatrix}$$

for some linear maps $b_{1,n} = E_{\alpha,1} \to E_{\alpha,n}$, and $\mathcal{M}_2(\tau') : \oplus_{n=2}^{n_\alpha} E_{\alpha,n} \to \oplus_{n=2}^{n_\alpha} E_{\alpha,n}$ is τ'-graded with $\tau' = (\tau_2, \dots, \tau_{n_\alpha - 1})$. For τ scalar, a τ-graded matrix is just a positive definite symmetric matrix. Here, the linear maps J_1, $b_{1,n}$ can be computed explicitly (as we did for J^0, B^0 and A^0 in section 5.1) using some formula for $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_\alpha$ that we voluntary omitted.

In order to compute the asymptotic of the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}_1$, one can apply a generalization of Lemma A.6 to matrices having the above structure. For this purpose, one can define a new sequence of matrices $\mathcal{M}^n_n$ by the following induction process. We let $\mathcal{M}^1_1 = \mathcal{M}_1$ and

$$\mathcal{M}^2_2 = \mathcal{M}_2 - B_1 J_1^{-1} B_1^*$$

which is well defined since J_1 is positive definite. Then, one can prove that $\mathcal{M}^2_2$ is τ'-graded. It has the form

$$\mathcal{M}^2_2 = \begin{pmatrix} J^2_2 & \tau_2 B^2_2(\tau'')^* \\ \tau_2 B^2_2(\tau'') & \tau_2^2 \mathcal{M}^2_3(\tau'') \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\tau'' = (\tau_3, \dots, \tau_{n_\alpha - 1})$ and $\mathcal{M}^2_3$ which is τ'''-graded with $\tau''' = (\tau_4, \dots, \tau_{n_\alpha - 1})$. Then, one defines

$$\mathcal{M}^3_3 = \mathcal{M}^2_3 - B^2_2 (J^2_2)^{-1} (B^2_2)^*$$

and one runs the procedure until the matrix $\mathcal{M}_1$ is totally decomposed. As it can be seen from the above formula, one has to check that the matrices J^n_n defined by induction are positive definite. For $J^1_1 = J_1$ and J^2_2, this can be done by using the same argument as the one used to prove that J^0 and $A^0 - (B^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}B^0$ are definite positive in section 6.1. For larger n, the situation becomes more intricate and we didn't manage to do it. However, if we were able to prove that the matrices J^n_n are definite positive, then it would not be difficult to prove that the set $SV(\alpha)$ of singular values of $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_\alpha$ satisfy

$$SV(\alpha) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{n_\alpha} h^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_{p_n}/h} (\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(J^n_n) + \mathcal{O}(h))$$



FIGURE 6.1. A potential verifying H(1,2)

where $\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(J_n^n)$ denotes the square-root of the eigenvalues of J_n^n.

6. Some examples

6.1. **Computations in dimension one under assumption H(1,2).** Let us compute the small eigenvalues of the potential ϕ represented in Figure 6.1.

As already noticed in the discussion below Theorem 1.1, there are exactly three equivalence classes for $\mathcal{R}$ in that case: $\mathcal{U}_1^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m}_{1,1}\}$, $\mathcal{U}_2^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,1}, \mathbf{m}_{2,2}\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_3^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,3}\}$. Let us denote by $\mathbf{s}_1$ the saddle point between $\mathbf{m}_{2,1}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{2,2}$, $\mathbf{s}_2$ the saddle point between $\mathbf{m}_{2,2}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ and $\mathbf{s}_3$ the saddle point between $\mathbf{m}_{1,1}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{2,3}$. Denote also $S_2 = \phi(\mathbf{s}_1) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \phi(\mathbf{s}_1) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})$ and $S_3 = \phi(\mathbf{s}_3) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})$. Observe also that for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, one has $H(\mathbf{m}) = \{\mathbf{m}\}$. Then the matrix $\mathcal{L}^{bkw}$ admits the following form

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw} = \left(\frac{h}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_{1,1}^2 & d_{1,2}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & d_{2,1}^2 & d_{2,2}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & d^3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the coefficients given by the following formula:

$$d_{1,1}^2 = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,1})|^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S_2/h}, \quad d_{1,2}^2 = -|\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})|^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S_2/h}$$

$$d_{2,1}^2 = 0, \quad d_{2,2}^2 = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_2)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})|^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S_2/h}, \quad d^3 = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_3)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})|^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-S_3/h}$$

The corresponding squares of singular values are then

$$\lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_3 = h|\phi''(\mathbf{s}_3)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})|^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-2S_3/h} \text{ and } \lambda_2^{\pm} = h\mu_2^{\pm} e^{-2S_2/h}$$

where $\mu_2^{\pm}$ are the square of the singular values of the matrix

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$$

with $a = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,1})|^{\frac{1}{4}}$, $b = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})|^{\frac{1}{4}}$ and $c = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_3)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})|^{\frac{1}{4}}$. It follows that

$$(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^2)^*\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} a^2 & -ab \\ -ab & b^2+c^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

whose eigenvalues could be computed handily. For instance, if $|\phi''(\mathbf{s})| = |\phi''(\mathbf{m})| = 1$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, one has

$$(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^2)^*\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

whose eigenvalues are $\lambda^{\pm} = \frac{3}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2}$

We would like to conclude this example by noticing that one has necessarily $\mu_2^+ \neq \mu_2^-$. Indeed, if one compute the characteristic polynomial of the above matrix, one finds $P(x) = x^2 - (a^2+b^2+c^2)x - c^2b^2$ whose discriminant is given by

$$\Delta = (a^2+b^2+c^2)^2 - 4b^2c^2 = (a^2+b^2+c^2+2bc)(a^2+(b-c)^2).$$

Since ϕ is a Morse function, one has $a \neq 0$ and hence $\Delta > 0$.

6.2. **Computations in dimension one under assumption H(2,2).** Suppose now that the potential ϕ is as represented in Figure 1.4. As already noticed there are exactly two equivalence classes for $\mathcal{R}$ in that case: $\mathcal{U}_1^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m}_{1,1}\}$, $\mathcal{U}_2^{(0)} = \{\mathbf{m}_{2,1}, \mathbf{m}_{2,2}, \mathbf{m}_{2,3}\}$, and again, one has $H(\mathbf{m}) = \{\mathbf{m}\}$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$. Let us denote by $\mathbf{s}_1$ the saddle point between $\mathbf{m}_{2,1}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{2,2}$, $\mathbf{s}_2$ the saddle point between $\mathbf{m}_{2,2}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{2,3}$ and $\mathbf{s}_3$ the saddle point between $\mathbf{m}_{2,3}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{1,1}$. Denote also $S_2 = \phi(\mathbf{s}_1) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,1}) = \phi(\mathbf{s}_1) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})$ and $S_3 = \phi(\mathbf{s}_2) - \phi(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})$. Then the matrix $\mathcal{L}^{bkw,''}$ admits the following form in the basis $(f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}_{2,3}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}_{2,1}}, f^{(0)}_{\mathbf{m}_{2,2}})$ and $(f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}_3}, f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}_1}, f^{(1)}_{\mathbf{s}_2})$

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,''} = \Big(\frac{h}{\pi}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_3/h} \begin{pmatrix} \iota & 0 & 0 \\ b_1 & 0 & b_2 e^{-(S_2-S_3)/h} \\ 0 & a_1 e^{-(S_2-S_3)/h} & a_2 e^{-(S_2-S_3)/h} \end{pmatrix}$$

with the leading terms of the coefficients given by the following formula:

$$\iota^0 = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_3)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})|^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad b_1^0 = -|\phi''(\mathbf{s}_2)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,3})|^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad b_2^0 = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_2)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})|^{\frac{1}{4}}$$

and

$$a_1^0 = |\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,1})|^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad a_2^0 = -|\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1)\phi''(\mathbf{m}_{2,2})|^{\frac{1}{4}}$$

In order to simplify the computation, assume that $\phi''(\mathbf{m}) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and $\phi''(\mathbf{s}_1) = \phi''(\mathbf{s}_2) = -1$. Denote $\theta = \phi''(\mathbf{s}_3)$ and $\tau = e^{-(S_2-S_3)/h}$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,''} = \Big(\frac{h}{\pi}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_3/h} \begin{pmatrix} \theta & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & \tau \\ 0 & \tau & -\tau \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, we can apply Theorem 5.2 with

$$a^0 = (1 \ -1), \ \iota_0 = \theta, \ b^0_{+-} = -1, \ b_{-+} = (0 \ 1).$$

It follows that the eigenvalues of order $e^{-S_2/h}$ are $\mu_\pm(h) = \left(\frac{h}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-S_2/h}(\lambda_\pm + \mathcal{O}(h))$ with $\lambda_\pm(h)$ eigenvalues of $M^0 := A^0 - (B^0)^*(J^0)^{-1}B^0$ with

$$A^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix},\ B^0 = (0\ -1),\ J^0 = 1 + \theta^2.$$

Hence

$$M^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2-\nu \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\nu = \frac{1}{1+\theta^2} \in]0,1[$. The eigenvalues of this matrix are

$$\lambda_\pm = \frac{3-\nu}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(3-\nu)^2 - 4(1-\nu)}}{2}$$

This can be seen as perturbations by the well of height S_3 of the eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm$ computed in the previous example (obtained by taking $\nu = 0$ in the above formula).

6.3. **Computations in higher dimension.** Consider the case of potential ϕ having $N \geq 3$ minima $\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_N$ and one local maximum at the origin as presented in Figure 6.2. Assume also that there are exactly N saddle points $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_N$, all at the same height $\phi(\mathbf{s}_j) = \sigma_2$ and that the set $\{\phi < \sigma_2\}$ has exactly N connected components $E_1, \dots, E_N$, each E_j containing the minimum m_j and that for all $j = 1, \dots, N$, $\{\mathbf{s}_j\} = \overline{E}_j \cap \overline{E}_{j+1}$ with the convention $E_{N+1} = E_1$. Assume in addition that all the $\phi(\mathbf{m}_j)$ are equal and denote $S = \sigma_2 - \phi(\mathbf{m}_1)$. Then, Assumption H(1,2) is satisfied. Let us choose $\mathbf{m}_1$ as global minimum associated to $\sigma_1 = \infty$. Then all the other minima are associated to the saddle value σ_2. It is clear that they all belong to the same equivalence class and that they are all of type II. Moreover, for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)} \setminus \{\mathbf{m}_1\}$, one has $H(\mathbf{m}) = \{\mathbf{m}\}$. Then, we can apply Theorem 4.1 to get the spectrum of the Witten Laplacian associated to ϕ. It follows that the eigenvalues are given by $\lambda_1 = 0$ and for all $n = 2, \dots, N$

$$\lambda_n(h) = b_n(h) e^{-2S/h}(1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha/h})) \tag{6.1}$$

where b_n admit a classical expansion $b_n(h) \simeq \frac{h}{\pi} \sum_{k\geq 0} b_{n,k} h^k$. Moreover, one has $b_{n,0} = \mu_n^2$ where μ_n is the nth singular value of the matrix

$$\mathcal{L}^{bkw} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 & -\alpha_2\beta_1 & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2\beta_2 & -\alpha_3\beta_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3\beta_3 & \ddots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & \alpha_{N-1}\beta_{N-1} & -\alpha_N\beta_{N-1} \\ -\alpha_1\beta_N & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & \alpha_N\beta_N \end{pmatrix}$$

where we denote $\alpha_j = \varphi''(\mathbf{m}_j)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ and $\beta_j = (-\varphi''(\mathbf{s}_j))^{\frac{1}{4}}$.



FIGURE 6.2. N wells in dimension two

If one assume additionally that α_j and β_j are independent of j, let say $\alpha_j = \alpha$ and $\beta_j = \beta$, then $\mathcal{L}^{bkw} = \alpha\beta\mathcal{A}$ with

$$\mathscr{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The singular values of $\mathscr{A}$ are the square root of the eigenvalues of

$$\mathscr{A}^*\mathscr{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

which are known to be $\nu_k = 2(1-\cos(\frac{2k\pi}{N}))$, $k = 0, \dots, N-1$. In particular, for all $2 \le k < \frac{N}{2}$, ν_k has multiplicity 2 since $\nu_k = \nu_{N-k}$.

Suppose now that the potential ϕ is invariant by rotation of angle $\frac{2\pi}{N}$, then (6.1) still holds true with $b_n(h)$ being the singular values of a matrix of the form

$$\mathscr{A} = \theta(h) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\theta(h) \simeq \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \theta_k$. Hence, the above computation is still available and it follows that for $2 \leq k < \frac{N}{2}$, $b_k(h) = b_{N-k}(h)$. This permits to recover the results of [8], section 7.4.

Appendix A. Some results in linear algebra

We collect here some helpful results of linear algebra.

Lemma A.1. (Fan inequalities) *Let A, B be two matrices and denote by μ_n the singular values of any matrix. Then*

$$\mu_n(AB) \leq \|B\|\mu_n(A)$$

$$\mu_n(AB) \leq \|A\|\mu_n(B)$$

where $\|C\|$ denotes the norm of $C : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ with $\mathbb{R}^\bullet$ endowed with ℓ^2 norms.

Proof. See [11]. □

Lemma A.2. *Let $A = \mathrm{diag}(A_1, \ldots, A_N)$ be a block diagonal matrix. Then the singular values of A are the singular values of the A_n counted with multiplicities.*

Proof. It is straightforward, since $A^*A = \mathrm{diag}(A_1^*A_1, \ldots, A_N^*A_N)$. □

Lemma A.3. *Let E, F be two finite dimensional vector spaces and $A(h) : E \to F$ be a family of linear operators indexed by a parameter $h \in]0, 1]$. Assume that $A(h)$ admits a classical expansion $A(h) \sim \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k A_k$ and that the matrix A_0 has non zero singular values. Then, for $h > 0$ small enough the singular values $\mu_n(h)$ of $A(h)$ admit a classical expansion*

$$\mu_n(h) \sim \sum_{k\geq 0} h^k \mu_n^k$$

where the μ_n^0 are the singular values of A_0.

Proof. Since the singular values of $A(h)$ are the eigenvalues of A^*A which is selfadjoint, the result follows easily from Kato's perturbation theory of analytic families of selfadjoint operators ([9], chap 2, section 1) applied to the expansion of A^*A in h powers cut at finite rank. □

Lemma A.4. *Let A be a $p\times(q+1)$ matrix and T a $(q+1)\times q$ matrix. Assume that $T^*T = Id$ and that $\ker A = \mathrm{Ran}(T)^\perp$. Then the singular values of A are $\{0, z_1, \ldots, z_q\}$ where $z_1, \ldots, z_q$ are the singular values of AT.*

Proof. First observe that since $\ker A = \mathrm{Ran}(T)^\perp$, then 0 is a singular value of multiplicity one of A. Let us denote $\tilde{\xi}_0$ a unit vector such that $\ker A = \mathbb{R}\tilde{\xi}_0$. By definition, there exists an orthonormal basis $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_q$ of $\mathbb{R}^q$ such that

$$T^*A^*AT\xi_k = z_k\xi_k \tag{A.1}$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, q$. Let us denote $\tilde{\xi}_k = T\xi_k$. Since $T^*T = Id$, then $\tilde{\xi}_k$ is an orthonormal family of $\mathbb{R}^{q+1}$. Moreover, since $\ker A = \mathrm{Ran}(T)^\perp$, then $\Xi = \{\tilde{\xi}_0, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_q\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^{q+1}$. Moreover, for all $k = 1, \dots, q$, it follows from (A.1) that

$$|A\tilde{\xi}_k|^2 = |AT\xi_k|^2 = z_k$$

This shows that the matrix A^*A in the basis Ξ is exactly $\mathrm{diag}(0, z_1, \dots, z_q)$ and proves the result. □

Corollary A.5. *Let $\widehat{M}$ be a $(q+1)\times(q+1)$ real symmetric positive matrix and T a $(q+1)\times q$ matrix. Assume that $T^*T = Id$ and that $\ker \widehat{M} = \mathrm{Ran}(T)^\perp$. Then the eigenvalues of $\widehat{M}$ are $\{0, z_1, \dots, z_q\}$ where $z_1, \dots, z_q$ are eigenvalues of $T^*\widehat{M}T$.*

Lemma A.6. *Let V_1, V_2 be two real finite dimensional vector spaces (of dimension n_1 and n_2 respectively) and $J : V_1 \to V_1$, $A : V_2 \to V_2$, $B : V_2 \to V_1$ be linear maps. Assume in addition that J and $A - B^*J^{-1}B$ are symmetric positive definite. Then, the spectrum of the linear operator $M_\epsilon : V_1 \times V_2 \to V_1 \times V_2$ defined by the matrix*

$$M_\epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} J & \epsilon B \\ \epsilon B^* & \epsilon^2 A \end{pmatrix}$$

satisfies $\sigma(M_\epsilon) = \sigma_s(M_\epsilon) \cup \sigma_\ell(M_\epsilon)$ with

$$\sigma_\ell(M_\epsilon) = \sigma(J) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$\sigma_s(M_\epsilon) = \epsilon^2 \sigma(A - B^*J^{-1}B)(1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)) \tag{A.3}$$

As a by-product, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, M_ϵ is invertible and its inverse satisfies

$$M_\epsilon^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1}) \\ \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1}) & \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.4}$$

Proof. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\mathcal{P}(\lambda) := M_\epsilon - \lambda = \begin{pmatrix} J - \lambda & \epsilon B \\ \epsilon B^* & \epsilon^2 A - \lambda \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.5}$$

This is an holomorphic function, and since it is non trivial, its inverse is well defined excepted for a finite number of values of λ which are exactly the $n_1 + n_2$ eigenvalues of M_ϵ. Moreover $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \mapsto \mathcal{P}(\lambda)^{-1}$ is meromorphic with poles in $\sigma(M_\epsilon)$ and for any μ in $\sigma(M_\epsilon)$, the rank of the residue of M_ϵ at μ is exactly the multiplicity of μ as an eigenvalue.

Let us first explain how we can find the n_1 eigenvalues of size 1. Let $\lambda_1^\ell, \dots, \lambda_{n_1}^\ell > 0$ denote the eigenvalues of the definite positive matrix J. Let $n = 1, \dots, n_1$ be fixed and consider $D_n = \{z \in \mathbb{C},\ |z - \lambda_n^\ell| \le M\epsilon^2\}$ for some $M > 0$ that will be chosen large enough later. Since $\lambda_n^\ell > 0$, then for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and $\lambda \in D_n$, the matrix $\epsilon^2 A - \lambda$ is invertible,

and $(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Hence, the standard Schur complement procedure shows that the inverse $\mathcal{E}(\lambda)$ of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} E(\lambda) & -\epsilon E(\lambda) B(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} \\ -\epsilon(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} B^* E(\lambda) & E_0(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.6}$$

with

$$E(\lambda) = \left(J - \lambda - \epsilon^2 B(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} B^* \right)^{-1}$$

and

$$E_0(\lambda) = (\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} + \epsilon^2 (\epsilon A - \lambda)^{-1} B^* E(\lambda) B (\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1}$$

Moreover, the eigenvalues of M_ϵ in D_n are exactly the values of λ for which $E(\lambda)$ is not invertible. Moreover, by the functional calculus and Cauchy formula, the number of eigenvalues (counted with multiplicity) in D_n is given by the rank of the projector $\Pi_n = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial D_n} \mathcal{P}(\lambda) d\lambda$. Since $\epsilon^2 A - \lambda$ is invertible one has

$$\Pi_n = \begin{pmatrix} E_n & E_n R_\epsilon \\ R_\epsilon^* E_n & R_\epsilon^* E_n R_\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.7}$$

with

$$E_n = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial D_n} \left(J - \lambda - \epsilon^2 B(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} B^* \right)^{-1} d\lambda$$

and $R_\epsilon = -\epsilon B(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda_n^\ell)^{-1}$. On the other hand, since for $\lambda \in \partial D_n$, $J - \lambda$ is invertible and $(J - \lambda)^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2} M^{-1})$, then

$$E_n = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial D_n} (J - \lambda)^{-1} \left(I - \epsilon^2 B(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} B^* (J - \lambda)^{-1} \right)^{-1} d\lambda$$

and for M large enough $\left(I - \epsilon^2 B(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda)^{-1} B^* (J - \lambda)^{-1}\right)^{-1}$ is holomorphic on ∂D_n so that the rank of E_n is exactly the multiplicity of μ_n. Moreover, from formula (A.7), on has

$$\Pi_n = \mathcal{R}_\epsilon^* \begin{pmatrix} E_n & 0 \\ 0 & E_n \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{R}_\epsilon$$

with $\mathcal{R}_\epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} I & R_\epsilon \\ 0 & R_\epsilon \end{pmatrix}$ and since R_ϵ is invertible then so is $\mathcal{R}_\epsilon$. Therefore, $rk(\Pi_n) = rk(E_n)$ which proves (A.2).

Let us now study the eigenvalues of size ϵ^2. Let $\lambda_1^s \leq \ldots, \leq \lambda_{n_2}^s$ denote the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix $A - B^* J^{-1} B$. Since $A - B^* J^{-1} B$ is positive definite, then $\lambda_1^s > 0$. Let $n \in \{1, \ldots, n_2\}$ be fixed and consider $D_n' = \{z \in \mathbb{C},\ |z - \epsilon^2 \lambda_n^s| \leq M \epsilon^4 \lambda_1^s\}$ for some $M > 0$ to be chosen large enough and the corresponding projector

$$\Pi_n' = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial D_n'} \mathcal{P}(\lambda) d\lambda = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial \tilde{D}_n'} \mathcal{P}(\epsilon^2 z) dz$$

with $\tilde{D}'_n = \{z \in \mathbb{C},\ |z - \lambda^s_n| \leq M\epsilon^2\lambda^s_1\}$. For $\lambda \in D'_n$ and $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, $J - \lambda$ is invertible and once again the Schur complement formula permits to write the invert of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$

$$\mathcal{E}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} E_0(\lambda) & -\epsilon(J-\lambda)^{-1}BE(\lambda) \\ -\epsilon E(\lambda)B^*(J-\lambda)^{-1} & E(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.8}$$

with

$$E(\lambda) = \Big(\epsilon^2 A - \lambda - \epsilon^2 B^*(J-\lambda)^{-1}B\Big)^{-1} \tag{A.9}$$

and

$$E_0(\lambda) = (J-\lambda)^{-1} + \epsilon^2(J-\lambda)^{-1}BE(\lambda)B^*(J-\lambda)^{-1} \tag{A.10}$$

For $\lambda = \epsilon^2 z$ with $|z - \lambda^s_n| = M\epsilon^2\lambda^s_1$, we get

$$E(\epsilon^2 z) = \epsilon^{-2}\Big(A - z - B^*(J - \epsilon^2 z)^{-1}B\Big)^{-1} = \epsilon^{-2}(A - B^*J^{-1}B - z)^{-1}(I + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2\lambda^s_n\|(A - B^*J^{-1}B - z)^{-1}\|)).$$

and since $\|(A - B^*J^{-1}B - z)^{-1}\| \leq (\lambda^s_1 M\epsilon^2)^{-1}$, it follows that

$$E(\epsilon^2 z) = \epsilon^{-2}(A - B^*J^{-1}B - z)^{-1}(I + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1})).$$

Integrating along $\partial\tilde{D}'_n$, we get

$$\Pi'_n = \begin{pmatrix} (R'_\epsilon)^* E'_n R'_\epsilon & (R'_\epsilon)^* E'_n \\ E'_n R'_\epsilon & E'_n \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.11}$$

with

$$E'_n = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2i\pi}\int_{\partial D'_n} E(\epsilon^2 z)dz = \frac{1}{2i\pi}\int_{\partial D'_n}\Big(A - B^*J^{-1}B - z\Big)^{-1}(I + \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}))^{-1}dz$$

This shows again that the rank of E'_n (and hence Π'_n) is exactly the multiplicity of λ^ℓ_n.

Eventually, we have to prove (A.4). Since M_ϵ is a symmetric matrix with positive spectrum, it is necessary invertible. Moreover, J and A being invertible, then M^{-1}_ϵ is given by $M^{-1}_\epsilon = \mathcal{E}(0)$ with $\mathcal{E}(\lambda)$ defined either by (A.6) or by (A.8). Both formula yield easily (A.4). The proof is complete.

□

Appendix B. On the equivalence class of $\mathcal{R}$

B.1. **An upper bound.** In this section, we prove an upper bound on the local number of equivalence classes of $\mathcal{R}$.

Proposition B.1. *Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be such that $E_-(\mathbf{m})$ contains at least one point of type II. Then, for all $\mathbf{m}' \in E_-(\mathbf{m})$, one has*

$$\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}') \Longrightarrow \mathbf{m}\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}'.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be as above and $\mathbf{m}' \in W := E_-(\mathbf{m})$ be such that $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}') = \sigma_k$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Assume by contradiction that $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$. Observe that since $\sigma(\mathbf{m}) = \sigma(\mathbf{m}')$ and $\mathbf{m}' \in W$, then $E_-(\mathbf{m}') = W$. Let

$$F_{\mathbf{m}} = \bigcup_{\nu \in \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})} \overline{E(\nu)},\ F_{\mathbf{m}'} = \bigcup_{\nu \in \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m}')} \overline{E(\nu)}.$$

These are two connected subsets of $\{\phi \leq \sigma_k\} \cap W$ and since $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m}') = \varnothing$, then $F_{\mathbf{m}} \cap F_{\mathbf{m}'} = \varnothing$. Let us introduce

$$\mathcal{U}_+^{(1)}(\sigma_k) = \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}^{(1)},\ \phi(\mathbf{s}) > \sigma_k\}.$$

and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of smooth path $\gamma : [0,1] \to W$ joining $\mathbf{m}$ to $\mathbf{m}'$ and such that $\gamma([0,1]) \cap \mathcal{U}_+^{(1)}(\sigma_k) = \varnothing$. By definition, $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$ belong to the same connected component W of $\{\phi < \sigma_{k-1}\}$. Hence there exists a path γ in W joining $\mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{m}'$. Moreover if $\gamma([0,1])$ contains any saddle point $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{U}_+^{(1)}(\sigma_k)$, since $\mathbf{s}$ can not be a ssp (because $\sigma_{k-1} > \phi(\mathbf{s}) > \sigma_k$), then we can modify γ in order that it doesn't meet $\mathbf{s}$. Hence the set $\mathcal{G}$ is not empty. Let

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\sup_{[0,1]} \phi \circ \gamma,\ \gamma \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Using Ascoli's Theorem we can easily construct a path $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\sup_{[0,1]} \phi \circ \gamma_0 = \inf \mathcal{M}$. We claim that

$$M := \sup_{[0,1]} \phi \circ \gamma_0 \leq \sigma_k. \tag{B.1}$$

Let us postpone the proof of this result and finish the proof of the proposition. Let us denote $t_{\mathbf{m}} = \max\{t, \gamma_0(t) \in F_m\}$.There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\forall t_{\mathbf{m}} < t < t_{\mathbf{m}} + \epsilon,\ \gamma(t) \notin F_{\mathbf{m}}. \tag{B.2}$$

Let $x_{\mathbf{m}} = \gamma_0(t_{\mathbf{m}})$. We claim that $x_{\mathbf{m}}$ is a saddle point. Indeed, $x_{\mathbf{m}}$ is necessary a critical point of ϕ, otherwise we would have $\phi \circ \gamma_0(t) > \sigma_k$ for $t > t_{\mathbf{m}}$ small enough. Suppose now that $x_{\mathbf{m}}$ is a critical point of index $p \neq 1$. For $r > 0$ small enough the set $\{x \in B(x_{\mathbf{m}}, r),\ \phi(x) < \sigma_k\}$ is connected (since $p \neq 1$). Hence $V_{\mathbf{m}} := \{x \in B(x_{\mathbf{m}}, r),\ \phi(x) \leq \sigma_k\}$ is contained in F_m. Since for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and $t_{\mathbf{m}} < t < t_{\mathbf{m}} + \epsilon$, one has $\gamma_0(t) \in B(\mathbf{m}, r)$ and since $\phi \circ \gamma_0 \leq \sigma_k$, then $\gamma_0(t) \in V_{\mathbf{m}} \subset F_{\mathbf{m}}$ which contradicts (B.2). Therefore, $x_{\mathbf{m}}$ is necessary a saddle point. Hence, there exists a connected component ω_1 of $\{\phi < \sigma_k\} \cap W$ such that $x_{\mathbf{m}} \in \overline{\omega}_1$ and

$$\forall \nu \in \mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m}),\ \omega_1 \neq E(\nu). \tag{B.3}$$

On the other hand, since W contains at least a point of type II, then ω_1 is either of the form $E(\mathbf{m}'')$ for some $\mathbf{m}'' \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ or $\omega_1 = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$. Thanks to (B.3), ω_1 can not be of the form $E(\mathbf{m}'')$, hence $\omega_1 = \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$ and we get

$$\overline{(\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}))} \cap F_{\mathbf{m}} \neq \varnothing. \tag{B.4}$$

Working similarly with $F_{\mathbf{m}'}$, we show that

$$\overline{(\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}))} \cap F_{\mathbf{m}'} \neq \varnothing. \tag{B.5}$$

and since $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m}) \in \widehat{\Omega}_{\sigma_k}$ by construction, it follows that $\mathbf{m} \mathcal{R} \mathbf{m}'$ which is a contradiction.

It remains to prove (B.1). For this purpose, we assume by contradiction that $M > \sigma_k$.

Lemma B.2. *There exists $r > 0$ such that for all $\nu \in X \setminus \mathcal{U}^{(1)}$ such that $\phi(\nu) = M$, the set $B(\nu, 2r) \cap \{\phi < M\}$ is arc-wise connected.*

Proof. This is straightforward, using local coordinates . □

Let us introduce the set

$$Y = \gamma_0([0,1]) \cap \{\phi = M\}.$$

By definition of $\mathcal{G}$, this is a compact set that contains no saddle point. There exists a covering

$$Y \subset Z := \bigcup_{n=1}^{N} B(x_n, r)$$

with $\phi(x_n) = M$ for all n. Using this covering of Y we shall construct a new path $\tilde{\gamma}_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\sup \phi \circ \gamma_0 < M$. Let us do this by induction on N.

Suppose first that $N = 1$ and let us denote $B_1 = B(x_1, r)$. Let

$$t^- = \inf\{t \in [0,1],\, \gamma(t) \in B_1\},\ t^+ = \sup\{t \in [0,1],\, \gamma(t) \in B_1\} \tag{B.6}$$

By compactness, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\sup\{\phi \circ \gamma(t),\ t \notin [t^-, t^+]\} < M - \epsilon$. By Lemma B.2, there exists a smooth path $\gamma_1 : [t^-, t^+] \to X$ joining $\gamma(t^-)$ to $\gamma(t^+)$, contained in $B_1 \cap \{\phi < M\}$ (and hence by compactness, there exists $\epsilon' > 0$ such that $\sup_{[t^-,t^+]} \phi \circ \gamma(t) < M - \epsilon'$). We then define $\tilde{\gamma}_0(t) = \gamma_1(t)$ if $t \in [t^-, t^+]$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_0(t) = \gamma_0(t)$ otherwise. Then $\sup \phi \circ \tilde{\gamma}_0 < M - \inf(\epsilon, \epsilon')$.

Let us now prove the induction step. We assume that the property is true at rank N. We define t^- by

$$t^- = \inf\{t \in [0,1],\, \gamma(t) \in Z\}, \tag{B.7}$$

and without loss of generality we can assume that $\gamma(t^-) \in B_1$. Then we let

$$t^+ = \sup\{t \in [0,1],\, \gamma(t) \in B_1\} \tag{B.8}$$

Denote $x^+ = \gamma_0(t^+)$ and assume first that $x^+ \notin Z' = \cup_{n=2}^{N} B(x_n, r)$, then $x^+ \notin Z$ and then $\phi \circ \gamma_0(t^+) < M - \epsilon$. Since we have also $\phi \circ \gamma_0(t^-) < M - \epsilon$, we can define $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ as in the previous case. Then the set

$$\tilde{Y} = \tilde{\gamma}_0([0,1]) \cap \{\phi = M\}$$

is covered by at most $N - 1$ ball and we conclude by induction.

Suppose now that $x^+ \in Z'$, let say $x^+ \in B_2$. Then $B_2 \cap B_1$ is non empty. Since it is open, contained in $\{\phi \le M\}$ and ϕ is a Morse function, then there exists $z_2 \in B_2 \cap B_1$ such that $\phi(z_2) < M$. Now we define the modified path $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ in the following way. Let $t_0 \in]t^-, t^+[$. We let $\tilde{\gamma}_0[t^-, t_0] \to B_1$ be a path joining $\gamma_0(t^-)$ to z_2 and contained in $\{\phi < M\}$ which is possible to construct thanks to Lemma B.2, and $\tilde{\gamma}_0 : [t_0, t^+] \to B_2$ be just a path joining z_2 and x_+. For $t \notin [t^-, t^+]$, we let $\tilde{\gamma}_0(t) = \gamma_0(t)$. Then, the path $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}$. Moreover, one has

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \phi \circ \tilde{\gamma}_0(t) \le M - \epsilon'$$

for some $\epsilon' > 0$. Hence we are reduced to modify the path $\hat{\gamma}_0 : [t_0, 1] \to X$ given by $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ on this time interval. But now we can apply the induction hypothesis since $\hat{\gamma}_0([t_0, 1]) \cap \{\phi = M\}$

is covered by at most $N-1$ balls. □

B.2. **Link between $\mathcal{R}$ and the Generic Assumption.**

Proposition B.3. *Suppose that the Generic Assumption is satisfied, that is for all* $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ *one has the following:*

i) $\phi_{|E(\mathbf{m})}$ *has a unique point of minimum*
ii) *if* $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)} \neq \varnothing$, *there exists a unique* $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$ *such that* $\phi(\mathbf{s}) = \sup E(\mathbf{m}) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. *In particular,* $E(\mathbf{m}) \cap \phi^{-1}(]-\infty, \phi(\mathbf{s})[)$ *is the union of exactly two different connected components.*

Then for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathbf{m})$ *is reduced to* $\{\mathbf{m}\}$.

Proof. If $\mathbf{m} = \underline{\mathbf{m}}$ there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $\mathbf{m} \in \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{0)}$ and apply Assumption ii) to $E_-(\mathbf{m})$. One has evidently $\mathcal{V}^{(1)} \cap E_-(\mathbf{m}) \neq \varnothing$ since it contains $\overline{E(\mathbf{m})} \subset E_-(\mathbf{m})$ and $E(\mathbf{m})$ is a critical component. Hence, $E_-(\mathbf{m}) \cap \{\phi < \sigma(\mathbf{m})\}$ has exactly two connected components: $\widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$ and $E(\mathbf{m})$. Suppose now that $\mathbf{m}'\mathcal{R}\mathbf{m}$. Then $\sigma(\mathbf{m}') = \sigma(\mathbf{m})$ and hence $\mathbf{m}' \notin \widehat{E}(\mathbf{m})$. Therefore $\mathbf{m}' \in E(\mathbf{m})$ which implies $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}'$. □

Appendix C. List of symbols

We enumerate the different notations used in the paper and give the first place they appear.

$\mathcal{U}^{(0)}, \mathcal{U}^{(1)}$	page 2	Γ_α	(2.7)
n_0, n_1	page 2	$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0),II}$	(2.13)
$\mathscr{F}(.)$	page 3	$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$	(2.19)
$\underline{\Sigma}$	page 4, Definition 1.1	$\theta_0^\alpha(\mathbf{m})$	(2.15)
$S, \boldsymbol{\sigma}$	page 6	$\widehat{H}_\alpha(\mathbf{m})$	(2.16)
μ_k	(1.4)	$\mathscr{T}^\alpha$	Definition 2.8
$\underline{\mathcal{U}}^{(0)}$	(1.5)	$\mathcal{L}^\pi$	(3.1)
E	(1.6)	$\mathcal{L}^{\pi,\prime}$	below (3.1)
$\Gamma(\mathbf{m})$	below (1.6)	$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime}$	(3.2)
$H(\mathbf{m})$	(1.7)	$\mathcal{L}^{bkw,\prime\prime}$	(3.4)
E_-	(1.8)	$\mathscr{L}$	above Lemma 3.2
$\widehat{E}$	(1.9)	$\mathscr{L}^\alpha$	(3.5)
$\hat{\mathbf{m}}$	(1.10)	$\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$	Lemma 3.3
$\mathcal{U}^{(0),I}, \mathcal{U}^{(0),II}$	page 7, Definition 1.3	$h_\phi(\mathbf{m})$	(3.6)
$\mathcal{R}$	page 7, Definition 1.5	$\widetilde{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$	(3.7)
$\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0)}$	(2.1)	$\mathscr{L}^\leq$	(3.13)
$\mathcal{A}, \underline{\mathcal{A}}$	below (2.1)	$\mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,I}, \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n,II}$	above (4.1)
q_α	below (2.1)	Υ_2	(4.1)
$\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),I}, \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(0),II}$	below (2.1)	Υ_1	(4.2)
$\mathcal{A}^{\leq n}$	(2.2)	$\mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,I}, \mathcal{A}_2^{\leq n,II}$	(5.1) and (5.2)
ν_+, ν_-	Lemma 2.3	$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(0)}$	(5.3)
$\mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}, \mathcal{A}_1^{\leq n}$	(2.3)	$\mathcal{V}_{\alpha,\pm}^{(1)}$	(5.4)
ν	below (2.3)	$\widehat{\mathscr{L}^\alpha}$	(5.5)
$\mathcal{V}_\alpha^{(1)}$	(2.5)	$\mathcal{R}^+, \mathcal{R}^-$	(5.6) and (5.7)
$\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha^{(0)}$	(2.6)	$j_\phi^\pm$	(5.8)

References

1. J.-F. Bony, F. Hérau, and L. Michel, *Tunnel effect for semiclassical random walks*, Analysis and PDE **8** (2015), no. 2, 289–332.
2. A. Bovier, V. Gayrard, and M. Klein, *Metastability in reversible diffusion processes. II. Precise asymptotics for small eigenvalues*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **7** (2005), no. 1, 69–99.
3. H. Cycon, R. Froese, W. Kirsch, and B. Simon, *Schrödinger operators with application to quantum mechanics and global geometry*, study ed., Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
4. B. Helffer, *Semi-classical analysis for the Schrödinger operator and applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1336, Springer-Verlag, 1988.
5. B. Helffer, M. Klein, and F. Nier, *Quantitative analysis of metastability in reversible diffusion processes via a Witten complex approach*, Mat. Contemp. **26** (2004), 41–85.

6. B. Helffer and F. Nier, *Quantitative analysis of metastability in reversible diffusion processes via a Witten complex approach: the case with boundary*, Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.) (2006), no. 105.
7. B. Helffer and J. Sjöstrand, *Puits multiples en mécanique semi-classique. IV. Étude du complexe de Witten*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **10** (1985), no. 3, 245–340.
8. F. Hérau, M. Hitrik, and J. Sjöstrand, *Tunnel effect and symmetries for Kramers-Fokker-Planck type operators*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **10** (2011), no. 3, 567–634.
9. T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 132, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1966.
10. D. Le Peutrec, *Small eigenvalues of the Neumann realization of the semiclassical Witten Laplacian*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **19** (2010), no. 3-4, 735–809.
11. B. Simon, *Trace ideals and their applications*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 35, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1979.
12. E. Witten, *Supersymmetry and Morse theory*, J. Differential Geom. **17** (1982), no. 4, 661–692 (1983).

Université Côte dAzur, CNRS, Laboratoire J.-A. Dieudonné, France
E-mail address: lmichel@unice.fr